

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. III

OCTOBER, 1918

No. 4

EDITORIAL

WHY do certain of our intellectuals devote infinite pains to learn the habits of a species of worm, to attempt the answer to some academic riddle or to add some minute discovery to our sum of historical knowledge, but content themselves with a half-crystallized doubt concerning their own eternal destiny? Is intellectuality of necessity antagonistic to the Christian faith? In endeavoring to throw light on this question, we have invited three students of science and philosophy to discuss respectively the attitudes of three great classes of the thinking world with respect to faith. Under the general head, *The Unbelieving Intellectuals and the Christian Faith*, Dr. Sweet in this issue opens the series with a paper upon *The Unbelieving Scientists*. He will be followed by Rev. Albert Clarke Wyckoff, upon *The Unbelieving Psychologists*, and Dr. William Hallock Johnson will present the concluding article, *The Unbelieving Philosophers*. In this opening discussion one is impressed with the idea that a notable difficulty with the scientists is their failure to think through the religious problem. In other words, since religious matters have traditionally been regarded as foreign

to scientific research, scientists incline to regard the projection of any spiritual question into their field as an intrusion, and to give the subject scant attention. The difficulty is with the scientific mind, in restricting its field. There is no conceivable reason why a scientist should be an intellectual recluse, avoiding his philosophic, religious, and artistic neighbors. All phenomena—physical, mental, spiritual—are the proper field of true science. They cannot successfully be walled off into mutually exclusive compartments, for the elements of the universe are amazingly and mysteriously interlocking.

One of the seeming paradoxes of the history of the Bible among the nations of the world is the persistence of the archaic form of the English translation. No race has done so much to give the Scriptures to all men everywhere in terms of their daily speech as have the English-speaking peoples, yet they alone have to content themselves with the Bible in a form of their tongue long since outgrown. In his article, *Wanted: A Bible in the Vernacular*, Dr. Burrell voices an idea that is constantly recurring to many minds. It would seem that the time must be almost ripe for the creation of a strong evangelical commission to provide a clear and dignified translation of the Bible into thoroughly modern English. A living language is constantly growing and being modified, and secular literature swiftly adapts itself accordingly, in order that the historian, the essayist, the philosopher, the scientist, the novelist, and even the dreamer and the poet may appeal with the greatest force to the largest numbers. Yet a strange prejudice for ancient and outworn forms obliges the timeless Christian faith to appear before English readers in

the garments of generations long departed. The reader is apt unconsciously to associate the Scriptures with the legend and myth of the past. With characteristic vigor Dr. Burrell both gives reasons for the proposed version and makes suggestions for proceeding to accomplish such a task.

To follow any subject of study in a random, hit-or-miss fashion not only wastes time and energy, but almost completely fails to accomplish satisfactory results. In the matter of Bible study, then, it is of very great importance to select a method with care and to follow it with perseverance. Still, method is not all. A sufficient motive must precede an efficient method. What moves one to study the Scriptures? Is he chiefly interested in history, in archeology, in literature, in criticism, in comparative religion or in ethics; does he look for material for acceptable pulpit discourses, for apt quotations or for authority for his belief and attitude in questions of public concern? What is, and what should be, his motive? In his most readable paper, *A Few Hints About Reading the Bible*, Principal Forsyth deals mainly with the answer to this question. He does, indeed, drop numerous practical suggestions that have to do more particularly with method, but he directs attention chiefly to the great impelling reasons that send a Christian to his Bible. In a high sense his contribution to this number is inspirational; in his brilliant and rather epigrammatic style he seeks to give his readers a large perspective of the essential nature of the Bible and of those lofty motives which should impel them to the search for its utmost truth.

The discriminating lover of poetry continually realizes how utterly inadequate is the perfection of

poetic form alone. He has also experienced—rather than observed—the prosiness of some “poetry” and the poetical effect of some prose. In a word, he has come to perceive that poetry is something infinitely beyond form and technique. When deeply moved by some noble theme, finely sympathetic souls are apt to swing into a subtle spiritual rhythm of thought, even of utterance. Here, if expression follows the channel of meter and verse, we call it poetry; however, it is rather only the form the poetry assumes. Modern literary criticism is freeing itself from the restrictions of classification and rule in its judgment of poetry. Speaking (in his recent little volume of essays upon *Creative Criticism*) of the mechanical rules and devices that have hampered true criticism, Professor Spingarn remarks that they will go “when Criticism clearly recognizes in every work a spiritual creation governed by its own laws.” Again: “All we can say is that out of the infinite variations of rhythm, we may conveniently classify the more irregular as prose and the more regular as verse.” Some such observations as these quoted will put the reader in the proper attitude to enjoy and profit by Mr. Beardslee’s study of *The Problem of Hebrew Poetry*. We may discover that the Hebrew poet long ago made a practical application of the principle that the true rhythm of poetry was that of thought rather than of form.

In his article upon Clement of Alexandria Dr. Sihler continues his studies of the spiritual and moral character of classic civilization and of the contact of Christianity with the pagan world. He has previously drawn largely upon classical and non-Christian sources in presenting the evidence for his views, but in this

instance he confines himself to the works of the great patristic scholar whose name stands as the title of the present paper. As in the previous contributions by this painstaking classicist, the writings consulted have been read afresh in the original, and the quotations are the author's own translations. One of the most striking features of this study is found in the influence of the early Clement, the pagan philosopher, upon the Clement of later life, the Christian Father. He could not wholly shake off the effect of the thinking which made Gnosticism the enemy of the Gospel; still, as this review of his life shows, where the issue was vital and clearly drawn, Clement stood with the church. In this he typified the period of church history in which he lived.

The whole subject of eschatology is likely to be avoided by many ministers, or to be touched upon with great caution, because of the ease with which it is so often perverted. Yet unfulfilled prophecy is an important part of the Scriptures and must very rightly remain an attractive field of study. Devout Christians, however, differ widely on questions of this kind. In such matters this periodical must not be regarded as necessarily committed to the particular view a contributor may present. When a considerable number of earnest, evangelical Bible students hold to some interpretation, not denominational, a sense of judicial fairness demands that they be given a hearing. The number and character of those holding the premillennial view of our Lord's return would alone justify attention to their claims. Dr. Thomas, who contributes the article upon Revelation, is a member of this school of interpreters. After summarizing the widely divergent interpretations of the Apocalypse,

he devotes most of his paper to analyses of the book by premillennial writers of his own group. We find here a concise comparison of the ideas of a company of men who have more or less of a following in our churches. The student who is approaching this subject, just now attracting increasing attention, should be reminded that even those of the premillennial view are far from being of one mind, either as to the wisdom of going much into detail in applying the symbolism of Revelation, or as to the meaning of many symbols even where detailed interpretation is attempted. Thorough as is this compilation, within the limits the author has set for it, one may yet wish that it included the views of a wider range of Biblical students of the same general persuasion.

THE UNBELIEVING INTELLECTUALS AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

I. THE UNBELIEVING SCIENTISTS

By LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET, S. T. D., Professor of Christian Theology
and Apologetics, Bible Teachers Training School

Is there something in the study of the physical sciences which *per se* tends toward religious negation? Many would answer this question unhesitatingly in the affirmative. A current saying has come down to us from the Middle Ages to the effect that when you meet three physicians you will find two atheists. George Romanes, at the end of the third of his famous articles on *The Influence of Science on Religion*, says: "As an outcome of the whole of this discussion, then, I think it appears that the influence of Science upon Natural Religion has been uniformly of a destructive character." On the basis of the widely heralded "conflict between science and religion" the popular verdict would probably be that it is extremely difficult for a physicist to be a believer in religion.

The evidence is not convincing. Even if it were true, as we do not believe it is true, that a catalogue of eminent physical scientists would show a majority in the ranks of unbelief, it would by no means prove that they were unbelievers because they were scientists. There are many sociologists and psychologists who are unbelievers, which does not prove that either of these subjects of study has any inherent tendency to produce unbelief. The same may be said of the study

¹Thoughts on Religion, edited by Bishop Gore, p. 91.

of law. In all these groups of students and thinkers the fact that many of those most profoundly versed in the technical arcana of their subjects have been convinced and ardent believers in religion effectually disposes of the notion that the unbelief of others is due to the necessary and intrinsic operation of the subjects in which they are engaged. As a matter of fact, the unbelief of a scientist, while expressing itself in scientific terms, may be due to circumstances altogether apart from his scientific occupation. That is to say, that particular scientist's unbelief may be due primarily to personal or individual factors, and only secondarily and indirectly to the influence of his scientific studies.

It is the purpose of this article to make an analysis of the religious ideas and experiences of certain men, eminent in the domain of the physical sciences, who have also left on record their ideas on the subject of religion. We shall trace the genesis and growth of their religious ideas so far as these are within our reach through published expressions of opinion, with special reference to the relationship of these opinions to ascertained scientific fact and legitimate inference based upon such fact. No unbelief not so grounded and conditioned can legitimately be termed scientific.

We shall begin with George John Romanes. Reference has already been made in *THE BIBLICAL REVIEW* (July, 1917) to the interesting and suggestive religious experience of this distinguished biologist. We shall now follow his intellectual processes somewhat in detail. The study is particularly valuable for our present purpose because his various early essays and subsequent notes represent the movement of one mind, self-recorded, "from a position of unbelief in

The Christian Revelation toward one of belief in it.” A condensed statement of Romanes’ negative argument, as expressed in *A Candid Examination of Theism*, follows.

The author, first of all, rejects the idea that the mystery of existence is explained by theism any better than by atheism, on the ground that this involves a shifting rather than a solution of mystery. He rejects the ontological argument in the form of the statement, “The heart needs a God,” on the ground that it does not involve objective reality. The universe cannot be interpreted in terms of man’s wishes.

He rejects the same argument in a supplementary form as, “Our theistic aspirations point to God,” for the reason that purely natural causes may account for such a belief. He rejects, by a general denial, the idea that the conception of God is a necessary thought. The argument from the analogy of human volition is rejected as a “monstrous stretch of inference.”

He then takes up the argument from causality, which he states in the form of a syllogism thus:

1. All known minds are caused by an unknown mind.
2. Our mind is a known mind.
3. Our mind is caused by an unknown mind.

To this he replies: (1) It does not account for mind (in the abstract) to refer it to a prior mind for its origin. If the premise is admitted it would be an explanation of mind. It all depends upon the assumption with which one starts out. (2) The idea that mind must be self-existent or caused by another mind is not warranted, “for anything within the whole range of the possible may, for aught that we can tell,

²*Op. cit.*, p. 6.

be competent to produce a self-conscious intelligence." It is to be noted here that this statement involves a denial that mind is *sui generis*. He also says in this connection that "what we call matter and force are to all appearances eternal, while we have no corresponding evidence of a mind that is even apparently eternal." So far as our experience goes "mind is invariably associated with highly differentiated collocations of matter and distributions of force and many facts go to prove and none to negative the conclusion that the grade of intelligence invariably depends upon, or at least, is associated with, a corresponding degree of cerebral organization. There is thus both a quantitative and qualitative relation between intelligence and cerebral organization."

The argument from the freedom of the will and the moral sense to the personality of God is rejected by a bald denial of the fact upon which the inference is based. "The theory of the freedom of the will is at this stage of thought utterly untenable. It is negatived deductively by the theory of evolution, and inductively by the doctrine of utilitarianism." The evidence is overwhelming that the moral sense is the outcome of a purely natural evolution and that the human conscience has grown out of the sense of pain and pleasure.

The argument from special design is rejected, first of all, on the ground that from the truth of mind in nature (granted) we could not infer any specific divine cognitions behind or in the natural processes. All we can be sure of is "the ubiquitous operation of general laws."

The broader design argument based upon the universal cosmic order he meets by the statement: "It

is as certainly true that all the exquisite beauty and melodious harmony of nature follow as inevitably from the persistence of force and the primary qualities of matter as it is certainly true that force is persistent or that matter is extended and impenetrable."

The correspondence between the human mind and the intelligible cosmos is due to the fact that the former is the product of the latter.

He rejects teleology from the scientific point of view as unnecessary, and from the psychological standpoint as offering no satisfactory solution of the problem of being. He argues as above that in the inference, from cosmic harmony, of a directing intelligence we postulate "an unknown mind" which does not help us.

He then reaches the conclusion that "so far as human science can penetrate or human thought infer, we can perceive no evidence of God." From the point of view of science, the hypothesis of God is superfluous. This negative conclusion is based upon the following postulates: (a) The persistence of force, (b) the eternity of matter, (c) the universality of natural law.

His cosmogenic creed is formulated thus: "Cosmic harmony results as a physically necessary consequence from the combined action of natural laws, which in turn result as a physically necessary consequence of the persistence of force and the primary qualities of matter." This last statement should be carefully studied because it is the formulated creed of the atheist who speaks in terms of physical science. As stated more tersely by Haeckel: "There is no God but necessity."

It is a great temptation to turn aside at this point and criticise the preceding argument in detail. It

could be done so very easily. It would not require a very keen logician to drive a coach-and-four through those propositions in almost any direction. But we are studying the mind of Romanes, and will therefore permit him to review his own positions.

In the Rede lecture of 1885 we find that already Romanes has moved away from the positions maintained so stoutly in the Candid Examination. In this lecture he announces that science is approaching the "conclusion that there is no motion without mind." Clinging at this time to his old position "that there is no mind without motion," he combines the old view and the new in the hypothesis, "there is no being without knowing." This statement, as Bishop Gore rightly points out, is compatible with pantheism or theism, according as one interprets it. The lecture involves a searching critique of materialism and shows that, seven years after the publication of the Essay on Theism, Romanes has broken loose from the rigid atheism into which he had betrayed himself.

In scattered notes of the year 1893 the editor finds the following noted by Romanes among the "certainties" attained by the human mind in the course of its investigations:

"Logical priority of mind over matter."

"The consequent untenability of materialism."

"The relativity of knowledge."

"The order of nature, conservation of energy and indestructibility of matter *within human experience* [*italics mine*], the principle of evolution and survival of the fittest."^a

I call especial attention to the italicized words. The significance of this qualification will appear later.

^a*Op. cit.*, p. 31f.; especially note p. 31.

It appears also from the Notes that between 1885 and 1893 Romanes had read and come into substantial agreement with the argument in Knight's *Aspects of Theism*. Romanes himself reaches the conclusion that the argument from evolution is valid only against special design, not against the teleological significance of the cosmic order in the large.

The Rede lecture and the isolated Notes just reviewed represent the more or less negative process whereby the hitherto imprisoned mind of the great biologist broke loose from its bonds. The first and almost the greatest step is indicated in the words, "within human experience," of the notes of 1893. The idea that our great scientific generalizations concerning the "persistence of force and the indestructibility of matter" either preclude theism or render it superfluous by affording an adequate explanation of the cosmic order involves the monstrous assumption, that the sphere of force and matter is universal, absolute, and final. If there should appear anywhere in the universe a phenomenon which cannot be accounted for by the persistence of physical force or the primary qualities of matter the explanation based upon them is transcended and at the same time, as an explanation, discredited. This Romanes was in the way of finding out by 1893.

Our next task is to point out from the Notes the positive movement of Romanes' mind away from the negative to the positive acceptance of the Christian religion. In order to make this intellectual movement quite clear, we shall state his ideas in a series of bald propositions, leaving criticisms and exposition to the end.

1. Experience modifies logic. His change of opinion was due in part to "the sub-conscious (and

therefore more or less unanalyzable) influence due to the ripening experience of life" (p. 106). While his logical processes seem intrinsically cogent, he felt that he had erred, (1) by exercising undue confidence in merely syllogistic conclusions, and (2) by failing to examine with sufficient care the validity of his premises. He says: "Never was anyone more arrogant in his claims for pure reason than I was, more arrogant in spirit though not in letter, this being due to contact with Science" (p. 107).

2. This led to the false assumption that "the existence of God is a merely physical problem, to be solved by man's reason alone, without reference to his other and higher faculties" (p. 108).

3. This radical vice of method led him to overlook the higher nature of man as demanding a higher cause "than anything merely physical or mechanical" (p. 108).

4. Romanes holds that while in religion we should be pure agnostics so far as reason is concerned (see below for the meaning of reason in this discussion), yet the arrival at this type of agnosticism is not the end of the matter—one "has then only begun his inquiry into the grounds and justifications of religious belief." Thus by exclusion he reaches the conviction that "there is nothing either in the science or philosophy of mankind inimical to the theory of natural causation being the energizing of a will objective to us" (p. 125).⁴ "The discovery of mechanism in Nature does not negate the religious affirmation because if the supposed will be self-consistent, its operations, as revealed in natural causation, must appear to us when considered *en bloc*

⁴*Cf.* also p. 128.

(or not piecemeal, as by savages) non-volitional or mechanical."

5. The common false hypothesis of religion and science which makes conflict between them possible is this: "If there is a personal God, He is not immediately concerned with natural causation." The consequence of this false premise is that, to both parties, every extension of the realm of secondary causation is a further restriction upon the activity of God.⁴ Science is only "the organized study of natural causation," and does not justify the dogmatism which foregoes the ultimate question at the descriptive frontier.⁵ The false assumption is that only the miraculous is divine. Really "all natural causation is inexplicable."⁶ Personality, however produced, is "seemingly an ultimate fact" (pp. 137, 139). Natural causation may be a producing force behind free-will without destroying the reality of freedom.

As a scientific man accustomed to make his reason sole arbiter of truth, Romanes says: "I was too jealous of [for?] my reason to exercise my will in the direction of my most heart-felt desires." "I cannot bring myself so much as to make a venture in the direction of faith" (p. 141). "The main ingredient of Christian faith is the moral element" (p. 148). Romanes says (of the former treatise): "I did not sufficiently appreciate the immense importance of human nature, as distinguished from physical nature" (p. 164).

He concludes that Christianity has successfully met the twofold crisis of Darwinism and the higher criticism, and even that "Agnosticism is performing

⁴See p. 91.

⁵See p. 129f.

⁶See p. 131 and statement on p. 135.

this great service to Christian faith; it is silencing all rational scepticism of the *a priori* kind" (p. 177).

The Scripture text which seems to have meant most to Romanes is John 7:17.^{*} There are several remarks which should be made in elucidation of the foregoing statements:

1. By the term "reason" Romanes always means the ratiocinative, or logical, faculty alone. By the rational process, therefore, he always refers to the process of inference whereby we arrive at the persuasion of truth. The fallacy which vitiated his entire approach to his subject in the *Candid Examination* was the failure to realize that reason so defined is purely an organizing faculty giving no positive knowledge except concerning its own processes. Romanes never entirely freed himself from this subtle fallacy (which enters into the very substance of Huxley's definition of agnosticism), for he naïvely contrasts the "above-board play of the syllogism" with the "under-hand cheating of consciousness" (p. 106). He seems to feel that he has deviated from the true path of scientific rectitude in allowing experience to modify logic, whereas, all that logic is expected to do is to allow itself to be modified by experience. If this were not so, what would be the value of scientific experiment?

2. The expression, "within human experience," in the notes of 1893 (p. 32) really goes far toward overturning the inverted pyramid of Romanes' early reasoning, because the moment one questions the universality of generalizations concerning force and matter which form the basis of the atheistic creed, the reasoning itself at once loses power. Has science

^{*}See p. 141 and elsewhere.

any way of demonstrating the persistence of force on the cosmic scale? Have we any way of proving that force is infinite, or of demonstrating the equivalence of various forms of energy throughout the entire extent of the universe and for its entire history? Are we altogether assured of the existence of "primary," or inherent, qualities of matter of a sort to account, even in part, for the harmony and beauty of the universe? We are far from certainty in these matters. We cannot offer demonstration here. And even if we could, it would be essentially futile because we should be simply explaining a thing by itself. In other words, atheism on the basis of scientific inductions with respect to matter and force, all legitimate hypotheses being admitted without question, is a complete *non sequitur*. This Romanes himself later came clearly to see.

3. It is quite clear that the negative conclusions reached by Romanes in his first inquiry were not forced upon him by any established scientific facts. He had simply reached the limit of inquiry by inductive scientific methods, which lies well this side of any positive convictions as to the spiritual world and the being of God. The limit of his thought was due to the limitation of his method, and was the beginning of a fresh line of investigation by another and higher method. What in his early inquiry he considered the end of all inquiry in blank and final negation was but the beginning of new and most fruitful investigation along other pathways.

4. The scientific, or more strictly speaking the inductive, method of investigation induces a habit of mind involving a certain amount of inertia which has to be overcome by a positive and sometimes painful

effort of the will. The adventure of faith involves certain "moral elements" which demand both self-abnegation and persistent effort.

Here we may appropriately take leave of this famous biologist who was far more than a biologist—in that he was a thinker and a seeker after God.

Professor Romanes has spoken somewhat disparagingly of Darwin's religious thinking. The words are well worth quoting: "What he (D.) says in his biography about Christianity shows no profundity of thought in the direction of philosophy or religion. *His mind was too purely inductive for this*" [italics mine]. On the whole, I am inclined to agree with this estimate, which was Darwin's own repeatedly expressed.* There is one thing, however, which I feel bound to point out in the case of Darwin. Romanes specifies Huxley as a pure agnostic, namely, one who occupies the position "of reasoned ignorance touching everything that lies beyond the sphere of sense-perception." Theoretically, of course, this was Huxley's position. Practically, however, as I shall endeavor to show in the next section, he was anything but a consistent agnostic. Darwin, I take it, comes immeasurably nearer being a typical and consistent agnostic. He confesses ignorance on all ultimate questions. Sometime I hope to present a systematic study of the mind of Darwin, a subject which has long exercised a great fascination for me. Now and here I can do no more than point out a few expressions which reveal his religious attitude.

It is a notable fact that in all the range of Darwin's writing there are few religious references of any sort. Of those which have come under my

*E. g., *Autobiography*, etc., American edition, p. 66.

eye, almost all were forced from him by criticisms upon his work, or by the correspondence of friends seeking to draw him out. There is a noticeable impatience in many of these expressions—apparently the superficial irritation of an absorbed man who is called away from congenial work by what he deems an interruption. Theological or metaphysical thought always made a demand upon him to which he felt little able or inclined to respond. He says, for example: "I cannot pretend to throw the least light on such abstruse problems. The mystery of the beginnings of all things is insoluble by us, and I for one must be content to remain an Agnostic."¹⁰ In a letter to Miss Wedgewood, about 1860, he admits that he did not clearly follow a part of her argument in an article sent him, saying by way of explanation, "which probably is in main part due to my not being at all accustomed to metaphysical trains of thought."

These passages and others of like tenor which might be cited show clearly the inhibiting influence upon varied powers of lifelong absorption in a single line of specialized activities. We are, of course, especially interested in Darwin's attitude toward the question of design in nature. In addition, we wish to know how far his views on evolution or his knowledge of ascertained scientific fact forced him into whatever position of religious negation he adopted. Both questions may be very briefly answered, and the answer is full of valuable suggestion.

The fullest exposition *in limine* of his views on this subject which I have been able to find follows. He has difficulty, he says, "in looking upon the cosmos including man with his capacity of looking far back-

¹⁰Life and Letters, p. 66.

wards and far into futurity as the result of blind chance or necessity. When thus reflecting, I feel compelled to look to a First Cause having an intelligent mind in some degree analogous to that of man; and I deserve to be called a Theist. This conclusion was strong in my mind about the time, as far as I can remember, when I wrote the *Origin of Species*, and it is since that time that it has very gradually, with many fluctuations, become weaker. But then arises the doubt—can the mind which has, as I fully believe, been developed from a mind as low as that of the lowest animals, be trusted when it draws such grand conclusions?" Then follows the sentence already quoted in which he professes himself an agnostic. This statement, so naïvely self-expressive and characteristically candid, is worthy of very careful consideration. We are made the confidants of a decaying conviction. What is the cause of this progressive weakening of a strong persuasion, ending finally in doubt and nescience?

The only suggestion here that has even a remotely scientific tinge is his reference to the doubt suggested by the evolutionary theory of the origin of the human mind. Of course, this is yet a hypothesis, a mere belief, however strongly intrenched in his mind. But, supposing the belief to be true, does it justify the rather paralyzing doubt here based upon it? If it does, then some rather unexpected results follow. If we are to allow doubts as to the competency of our minds based on their lowly derivation, where shall we draw the line? If we cannot be theologians, sure of an answer to the obstinate questioning of our minds with their capacity "of looking far backward and far into futurity," can we be scientists and be sure that we have traced correctly the upward movement of

mind from its lowly beginnings? The validity of scientific generalization demands a confidence in mind *as such*, irrespective of its origin. In other words, if we allow the theory of evolution to undermine our confidence in the trustworthiness of the instrument by which among other things we have built up the theory of evolution, it will break down long before we get to theology. Science has quite as much as philosophy to fear from such a theory. It ignores the familiar principle that an evolutionary process is to be interpreted in terms of its mature outcome, not its tentative beginnings. The mind of man was once the mind of an infant, but it is not on that account to be distrusted since now it is the mind of a man.

Darwin's hesitancy concerning the argument for design is based mainly upon two considerations: (1) The darker aspects of nature as interpreted through the struggle for existence."¹¹ For example, he says (in a letter to Professor Asa Gray under date of May 22, 1860, *Life and Letters*, p. 249) "with respect to the theological view of the question raised in connection with the *Origin of Species*. This is always painful to me. I am bewildered. I had no intention of writing atheistically." Then, after speaking of the widespread suffering discernible in nature, he says: "I feel most deeply that the whole subject is too profound for the human intellect." Here we have the dominant note of his theological address—bewilderment, acute distress, and what I cannot help feeling to be a genuine sense of incompetence in face of profound and difficult problems. The usual agnostic tone of intellectual superiority, masked by an ostensible confession of ignorance, is lacking. That Darwin's

¹¹See *Life and Letters*, pp. 62, 63, 67, etc.

views did not necessarily involve atheism or unbelief in God and revelation has been contended for so often and by such unimpeachable witnesses, as McCosh, Asa Gray, Joseph LeConte, Mivart, Romanes, Joseph Cook,¹² that we need not dwell upon it. It is interesting to note, however, that Darwin himself felt that his scheme was by no means necessarily antitheistic—which means that his unbelief was not grounded in the demonstrated truths of science. In the letter to Professor Asa Gray, already quoted, he says: “Certainly I agree with you that my views are not at all necessarily atheistical.”¹³

There is one other very famous passage from the biography of Darwin, which will let us into the very core of his thinking on the subject of design. It is also found in the correspondence with Asa Gray, who seems to have labored with his friend assiduously. Darwin says:¹⁴ “Your question what would convince me of design is a poser. If I saw an angel come down to teach us good, and I was convinced from others seeing him that I was not mad, I should believe in design. If I could be convinced thoroughly that life and mind was [were?] in an unknown way a function of other imponderable force, I should be convinced. If man was made of brass or iron, and no way connected with any other organism which had ever lived, I should perhaps be convinced.”

As an argument, or even as an expression of real difficulties, this statement is thoroughly worthless. As a psychological document it is of inestimable value. In the most unconscious way, it reveals the whole set of uncompromising prepossessions under the con-

¹²See Monday Lectures, Biology, 1876.

¹³*Op. cit.*, p. 248.

¹⁴Life and Letters, p. 263f.

trolling influence of which Darwin approached the question of the divine in nature. (1) The first statement indicates that the divine in nature is beyond his apprehension. Only the divine outside of nature could convince him. In other words, only the miraculous can be divine. The second sentence indicates that, for the time being at least, Darwin had lost sight of the fact that both life and mind *as such* are imponderable forces. Could he possibly be unaware that even his penetrating eyes had never seen life itself? The third sentence is the most illuminating of all because it reveals the idea that a vital process with successive phases of movement cannot be designed. To show design, or the action of creative power, demands an immediate, isolated, mechanical fabrication on the spot. This is so utterly opposed to the impression made by the mysterious and yet beautiful processes of birth and growth on countless minds, the most brilliant and penetrating, that we need not consider it other than the weakness and idiosyncrasy of a powerful but not quite symmetrically developed mind. At any rate, it is quite clear that Darwin's unbelief was not scientific in the sense that even he felt it to be the inevitable logic of known facts of nature. On the contrary, it looks very much like a stubborn intellectual prejudice that puts the scale of proof unreasonably high in order to block an unwelcome conviction. That gives me the opportunity to say that this element of bias or stubbornness was undoubtedly unconscious, for a more candid soul than Darwin it would be difficult to find.

It has often been pointed out (by the Duke of Argyl and others¹⁵) that Darwin in describing natural

¹⁵See Reign of Law, ch. 1, and Unity of Nature, p. 283f.

processes is compelled to use the language of design. For example, take this statement from the first chapter of *Fertilization of Orchids*: "If this [device for delaying insects in sipping nectar] is accidental, it is a fortunate accident for the plant. If this be not accidental, and I cannot believe it to be accidental, what a singular case of adaptation."

(2) Darwin's second leading objection to the idea of design was due to the difficulty of explaining every incidental detail as due to an immediate forethought and purpose of the Creator.¹⁶ As this is no essential part of the design argument, we need not dwell upon it at length.¹⁷

I wish to approach the study of Huxley and Tyndall, these twin colossi of science, whom, following the prevalent fashion, we shall couple together, through a few isolated sentences from Romanes. "Huxley, in *Lay Sermons*, says that faith has been proved a 'cardinal sin' by science. The fact is, Huxley falls into the common error of identifying 'faith' with opinion."¹⁸ "Unbelief is usually due to indolence, often to prejudice and never is a thing to be proud of."¹⁹

"It would be against reason itself to suppose that God, even if He exists, can be known by reason [logic]. He must be known, if knowable at all, by intuition."²⁰

Religious experience "may be studied objectively even if not experienced subjectively" and thus become the basis of rational conviction.²¹ With these sentences

¹⁶See *Life and Letters*, p. 264, and particularly *Plants and Animals under Domestication*, American ed., 1900, p. 414f.

¹⁷*Cf.* Ward, *Naturalism and Agnosticism*, Vol. 2, p. 277f.

¹⁸*Thoughts*, p. 150f.

¹⁹*Op. cit.*, p. 154.

²⁰*Op. cit.*, p. 156.

²¹*Op. cit.*, p. 157f.

in mind we shall study the religious thought of Huxley through three well-known and characteristic passages.

The first is the famous definition of agnosticism by its reputed inventor. "Agnosticism," he says, "in fact, is not a creed but a method, the essence of which lies in the rigorous application of a single principle.

* * * Positively, the principle may be thus expressed, in matters of the intellect, follow your reason as far as it will take you, without regard to any other consideration. And, negatively, in matters of the intellect, do not pretend that conclusions are certain which are not demonstrated or demonstrable. That, I take to be the Agnostic faith, which if a man keep whole and undefiled, he shall not be ashamed to look the Universe in the face, whatever the future may have in store for him."²²

This so-called "agnosticism" is simply the every-day working principle of any man who is at once intelligent and intellectually honest. The great limitation of the principle itself is that *no man ever has or ever can strictly live up to it*. It is simply a restatement of Locke's aphorism and, *per se*, has nothing to do either with belief or disbelief in religion. His convictions will overflow the banks established for them and in spite of himself and his principle he will believe beyond his demonstrations." Conspicuously is this true of Professor Huxley.

Let us place alongside of this definition of agnosticism the same man's definition of evolution: "The whole world, living and not living, is the result of the mutual attractions according to definite laws of the powers possessed by the molecules of which

²²Nineteenth Century, February, 1889.

²³See Balfour, Theism and Humanism, p. 145f.

the primitive nebulosity of the Universe was composed.”²⁴

Upon this statement I remark, first, that it is utterly incapable of inductive proof.

(a) It assumes as its basis and starting point what can never be altogether certain, a primitive nebulosity—whatever exactly that may mean, for the word “primitive” is very obscure in this connection.

(b) It assumes that the present molecules of the universe, with their powers practically unchanged, were present in the assumed primitive nebulosity.

(c) It assumes that nothing has been added to or taken from the original molecules, of which the universe was composed when it was in its primitive state.

Taking into consideration these three assumptions, it is quite evident that no inductive proof of evolution so described is either possible or even conceivable. Professor Huxley himself would have been the first to acknowledge this, and yet it is clear from countless passages in his writings that the great agnostic believed this account of the universe to be a true one. This seems to me a curious kind of agnosticism.

Moreover, this is just the beginning of bold and far-reaching assumptions involved in the above definition. Here is a partial, and only a partial, list:

(1) The universe, so far as its constituent molecules are concerned, was self-contained in its beginnings.

(2) Evolution is simply the movement, adjustment, and distribution of the original molecules of which the universe was composed.

(3) These molecules were free and active, since they immediately began through action and interaction to form the universe as it now is.

²⁴Life of Darwin, II, p. 210.

(4) These original molecules were *alive*, for they produced or became the living world. Organic life is simply one phase (inorganic movement being another) of the history of molecules the essential qualities of which remain unchanged.

(5) These original molecules were intelligent, for they entered into combinations according to certain ideal principles called "laws" and ultimately produced the world of intelligence, simply through native powers and mutual attractions.

We are not here concerned with the truth or falsity of this cosmogenic scheme. What interests us now is to relate a world-view so ambitious and speculative with the pure "faith" of agnosticism as Huxley defines it. And it simply refuses to relate. The trouble is that there is not enough positive evidence to justify the confident assertion of a single one of the considerable group of assumptions which we have just reviewed. It is fair to say that the principle of agnosticism, in both its negative and positive applications, has been violated by its most conspicuous apostle. Negatively, he has gone beyond his own intellectual sanctions in giving his adherence to the molecular theory of evolution just stated.

This theory logically involves abiogenesis, for, as Huxley himself says: "If the hypothesis of evolution is true, living matter must have arisen from non-living matter." But concerning abiogenesis he says in the same context: "The properties of living matter distinguish it from all other kinds of things; and the present state of knowledge furnishes us with no link between the living and non-living."²⁵

²⁵See Encyclopaedia Britannica, 9th ed., pp. 679, 689, *et passim*.

He also says: "For abiogenesis, there is at the present moment not a shadow of trustworthy evidence." A very simple logical combination of Huxley's own statements finds him profoundly convinced of a system of interpretation which is neither demonstrated nor demonstrable. I, for one, do not blame him, but surely he ought to be consistent and not refuse to do in religion what he does in science. We may note in passing that his particular theory of evolution also logically involves materialism, which Huxley elsewhere expressly repudiates, once at least, by calling it "a short-hand idealism."²⁰ We shall not, however, really penetrate the mind of Huxley until we canvass a statement of his on the subject of the Christian religion.

In a personal letter to the Dean of Wells (quoted by permission in Gore's *Incarnation of the Son of God*, p. 266) under date of April 27, 1877, Professor Huxley says: "I have not the slightest objection to offer *a priori* to all the propositions in the three creeds. The mysteries of the Church are child's play compared with the mysteries of Nature. The doctrine of the Trinity is not more puzzling than the necessary antinomies of physical speculation; virgin procreation and resuscitation from apparent death are ordinary phenomena for the naturalist. It would be a great error, therefore, to suppose that the Agnostic rejects Theology because of its puzzles and wonders. He rejects simply because in his judgment there would be no evidence to warrant the Theological propositions even if they related to the commonest and most obvious every-day propositions."

What does this amazing statement mean? It is obviously a betrayal of his case. Huxley reduces the

²⁰Lay Sermons, p. 156f.

obstacles to belief in Christianity, drawn from the transcendent character of its affirmations, to a minimum, and then calmly asserts the insufficiency of its evidence to justify belief in a system which demands no exceptional weight of proof. This position cannot be maintained. Every close student of theistic and Christian evidences, whether believer or unbeliever, well knows that the balance of argument is quite otherwise. The only tenable position of anti-Christian negation is in the unique and transcendent character of the Christian facts or interpretations of fact. But this statement, worthless as an argument and untenable to the point of grotesqueness, is yet a valuable sidelight on the mind of Huxley.

Compare Huxley's eagerness to believe beyond the evidence in the matter of evolution, abiogenesis, materialistic idealism, and all, with his seeming utter inability even to estimate the weight of Christian evidences, and the clue to his unbelief lies in your hand. Huxley's paradox really means that the inductive method *as applied* in the physical sciences does not reach to the spiritual realm and that the apprehension of God is something more than the attainment of a scientific generalization.

On the other hand, it is important to notice that Huxley's negation is not the logical or necessary outcome of any unified scientific observations. It is really not lack of evidence that bars the way to faith for him, but a certain inward bias of mind, an unresponsiveness of disposition to which the testimony fails to make an adequate appeal. It is not too much to say that Huxley's attitude reveals an anti-theistic bias which neutralizes the force of his thought as a scientist. On the logic of his main position as an

agnostic I can see no reason for his not being a convinced Christian theist, as many men certainly have been. This consideration lends additional meaning and something of pathos to the words of John Fiske regarding his relationship to Huxley: "In our many talks, however, I always felt that along with abundant general sympathy, there was a discernible difference in mental attitude. Upon the proposition that the foundation of morality is to * * * give up pretending to believe that for which there is no evidence, we were heartily agreed. But I often found myself more strongly inclined than my dear friend to ask the Tennysonian question

'Who forged that other influence

'That heat of inward evidence,

'By which he doubts against the Sense?" "

The case of Huxley's friend and colleague, John Tyndall, is particularly interesting because in him a certain tendency, merely discernible in Huxley, comes clearly to the surface. Tyndall exhibits two important, and yet in a measure contradictory, traits.

One is the operation of what we may venture to call a mass-psychology among scientists, an almost partisan solidarity which leads them to proclaim the sufficiency of science in face of their own declared sense of its limitations. For example, in a famous address on the Scientific Use of the Imagination (1870) Tyndall spoke of "these evolutionary notions" (meaning, of course, theories of the Huxleyan type) as "absurd, monstrous and fit only for the intellectual gibbet." Yet we find him so conformed to the scientific tendency of the time as to attempt a new definition of matter in order to strengthen the attack upon the idea of supernatural creation. This new definition

of matter involves the simple, though logically somewhat saltatory, process of ascribing to matter the qualities of mind.

But, as has been pointed out a score of times and yet not often enough, Tyndall does not so modify the notion of matter so as to save the uniqueness of mind but "persists in treating mind as if it were capable of being adequately represented by molecular changes of matter in the ordinary acceptance of the word."²⁷ This is done in spite of Tyndall's recognition and acknowledgment of the impassable chasm between mental and physical phenomena.²⁸ In other words, Tyndall is a materialist in spite of the logic of his own scientific observation and analysis, as well as his deeper feelings.²⁹

Another tendency is discernible in the working of Tyndall's mind—the conflict between his sober judgment as a scientist and his irresistible impulse to high-flying speculation when his imagination and emotions are kindled.

We have already discovered three Huxleys: (1) The inductive scientist, (2) the religious agnostic rigidly applying the inductive method in negative fashion to the things of the spirit, (3) the speculative physical philosopher outflying his slow-footed inductive processes by far-reaching suppositions as to what "must have been" in the remote past, or will be in the still more remote future.

We find ourselves compelled to make a similar critical analysis of Professor Tyndall. For example, he says in one place: "Those who hold the doctrine of evolution are by no means ignorant of the uncer-

²⁷Orr, *Christian View of God and the World*, p. 145.

²⁸*Fragments of Science*, p. 87.

²⁹See *Additions to Belfast Address*, authorized edition.

tainty of their data, and they yield no more than a provisional assent."³⁰ This cautious statement is to be compared with what has been called "the high-faluting metaphysic" of the following: "For what are the core and essence of this hypothesis? Strip it naked and you stand face to face with the notion that not alone the more ignoble forms of animalculae or animal life, not alone the noblest forms of the horse and lion, not alone the exquisite and wonderful mechanism of the human body, but that the human mind itself—emotion, intellect, will and all their phenomena were once latent in a fiery cloud."³¹

The conclusion to which we are led by a study of the mental processes of these men is very simple and very obvious. It is that as scientists, keeping at home in their own departments, they have no answers to ultimate questions, and that only by the illegitimate extension of their methods into fields where they do not apply are these quasi-scientific negations attained.

Another feature of their thinking is to be noted. Through exclusive attention to the inductive method as *applied departmentally* in the physical sciences, they have become not more but less competent to deal with spiritual problems. As an illuminating example, take this statement from the Belfast address: "If Mr. Darwin rejects the notion of creative power acting after human fashion, it is certainly not because he is unacquainted with the numberless exquisite adaptations on which the notion of a supernatural artifice is founded." One hardly knows which is most striking in this statement, the skill with which the rejected idea of creation is discredited in the very statement of

³⁰Fragments of Science, 1st series, p. 166.

³¹*Op. cit.*, p. 132.

it, the fatal admission with which the denial is accompanied, or the child-like confusion of ideas upon which the whole contention rests. The Duke of Argyll is quite right in saying that the propositions which underlie this statement "have been refuted the moment the definition of them has been attained."

We may fittingly bring this discussion to a close by a rapid glance in conjunction at two men whose close and peculiar relationship to each other forms one of the most interesting chapters in the history of modern thought. I refer, of course, to Herbert Spencer and John Fiske. Both these men would naturally be classed as philosophers, but there is good reason for grouping them with the scientists. In both the approach to philosophy was through science, and with Spencer particularly the interpretation of science was a master passion throughout his work.

As is well known, Fiske was a disciple of Spencer. Spencer ranks as an agnostic—the philosophical agnostic *par excellence*. Fiske was a convinced theist and an able exponent and interpreter of theism. And, what is the remarkable thing, Fiske always claimed that his theism was the logical carrying out of Spencer's ideas. He also maintained consistently that Spencer's agnosticism was no more intended "to refine God away into nothing" than St. Paul's statement "who hath known the mind of the Lord," etc."

I can see in this claim for Spencer little more than a student's enthusiasm and partiality for his favorite teacher. Nevertheless, in all matters pertaining to Spencer, Fiske has a right to be heard. Moreover, in the latest and so far as I know most dis-

²²See *Unity of Nature*, American ed., 1884, p. 277f.

²³Through *Nature to God*, p. 149f.

criminating biography of Spencer (by Elliott, in *Makers of the Nineteenth Century Series*) it is asserted: "Spencer professed himself to be an Agnostic, but his agnosticism travelled in the course of years from the verge of Atheism to the verge of Theology" (p. 227). There must be, therefore, some justification for Fiske's claim that Spencer's system logically involved theism.

There are two elements in the mental history of Spencer which I wish to make clear in the interests of this discussion. First, his religious negations, of whatever sort they were, had no logical basis in physical science. This cannot be made too emphatic. As a matter of fact, Spencer's philosophy in general was not really grounded in science. As his biographer, who is at once sympathetic and discriminating, says: "The whole of Spencer's philosophy was worked out by the deductive method" (p. 84).^a

Second, Spencer's system was due to an idiosyncrasy of mental temperament having no direct connection with objective scientific facts. His biographer points out that as a young man he took naturally to mechanics and mathematics, and that his system of thought partook of these two sciences. "His philosophy is in many respects Euclidean in form and his scheme of phenomena is such as may be seen in imagination; the world is laid out on the plan of a geometrical diagram" (p. 57). This accounts, in a way, for Spencer's curiously illogical attitude toward the three possible views of the world involved in atheism, pantheism, and theism. Elliott, with more severity than I should venture to use, calls Spencer's doctrine of the "Unknowable" "a

^aSee also for fuller exposition, p. 56ff.

tissue of meaningless verbiage, the commonest and most discredited type of metaphysics" (p. 223).

We turn with renewed interest to Spencer's far more interesting and attractive disciple Fiske. The latter, at any rate, never leaves us in doubt as to what he thinks and means to say. The foremost fact in Fiske's treatment of religion so far as our present interest is concerned is that it is frankly and, as he feels, solidly grounded in science. He speaks with enthusiasm "of the unshakeable Theism which is in harmony with the doctrine of evolution." He holds that "the Doctrine of Evolution, properly understood, does not leave the scales equally balanced between Materialism and Theism, but irredeemably discredits the former, while it places the latter upon a firmer foundation than it has ever before occupied."³⁵ He maintains that Haeckel's cosmic atheism was "never reached through a scientific study of evolution; it is nothing but an echo from the French speculation of the 18th Century." He says also: "When we have once thoroughly grasped the monotheistic conception of the Universe as an organic whole, animated by the omnipresent spirit of God, we have forever taken leave of that materialism to which the Universe was merely an endless multitude of phenomena" (p. 11).

Fiske's argument for immortality, drawn from Spencer's definition of life, is one of the most thrilling logical achievements I know of anywhere in religious literature. He argues on the basis of nature's continuity and upward movement through successive and expanding areas of vital correspondence, for an unseen and eternal environment for man's spiritual being (p. 190f.).

³⁵Through Nature to God, p. 9.

He derives his religious interpretations direct from evolution thus: "Of all the implications of evolution with regard to Man, I believe the very deepest and strongest to be that which asserts the Everlasting Reality of Religion" (p. 191).

And his final word in this vital book (which should be read in connection with his *Destiny of Man*, 1884, and *Idea of God*, 1885) runs thus: "We have at length reached a stage where it is becoming daily more and more apparent that with the deeper study of Nature the old strife between faith and knowledge is drawing to a close."²²

The gist of this whole investigation, which might be indefinitely enlarged without any essential modification of its outcome, is contained, or at any rate suggested, by an anecdote related by James Martineau in the preface to his great *Study of Religion*.²³ An eminent English positivist who had become a personal friend of John Fiske, heard that the latter had expressed in *The Destiny of Man* a belief in individual immortality, and exclaimed: "What, John Fiske say that? Well, it only proves, what I have always maintained, that you cannot make the slightest concession to metaphysics without ending in a Theology!"

This is the great lesson which long ago we should have learned. The physical sciences are *ex necessitate* positivistic—they can deal only with phenomena. The moment that ultimate questions as to being and cause are raised the sciences become silent and *Science*, a broader and diviner word altogether, must be allowed to speak. And what she says is this: No questions

²²*Op. cit.*, p. 194.

²³Second ed., Oxford, 1900.

such as these can be answered apart from God. In religion based on knowledge and knowledge perfected in religion the reason and heart are enabled to make one harmonious music. The enlightened mind finds a meaning in

Those first affections,
Those shadowy recollections,
Which, be they what they may,
Are yet the foundation light of all our day,
Are yet the master light of all our seeing;
Uphold us, cherish, and have power to make
Our noisy years seem moments in the being
Of the Eternal Silence: truths that wake,
To perish never!

NEW YORK.

WANTED: A BIBLE IN THE VERNACULAR

By DAVID JAMES BURRELL, D. D., LL. D., Pastor of the Marble Collegiate Church, New York

AT the outset let me say that I believe in the truth of the Scriptures from beginning to end as the inspired word of God.

By this I mean that the original autograph of the Scriptures was absolutely flawless, and this in the necessity of the case. Not a few definitions of the word inspiration have been given by divers men in divers places, but the least it can possibly mean is such a divine equipment as to prove a safeguard from all possibility of error. The etymological and Scriptural definition of the word is "God-breathed," and it goes without saying that God could not breathe a lie. Wherefore there could have been no errors in the Scriptures as they left the pens of "holy men who wrote as they were moved by the Spirit of God."

But how about current versions? It is safe to say that all such as have been produced under authority are so far free from doctrinal or ethical errors as to warrant their universal acceptance without doubt or misgiving as "an infallible rule of faith and practice." This is not to say that they contain no discrepancies of any sort, but these discrepancies are without exception of such a character as to warrant the following conclusions: First, that they are obviously due to the processes of translation and transmission along the ages; second, that in these processes the original manuscript has been singularly safeguarded by a special providence; and third, that the Scriptures as

we have them are entirely worthy of confidence for all the requirements of life here and hereafter. Why, then, should we not be satisfied with them?

Here is a singular fact; of the five hundred or more translations of the Bible our English Bible is *the only one*, so far as the writer knows, that is not in the vernacular of the people. The King James version, published in 1611, is still in general use throughout the Anglo-Saxon world. An attempt at a revision was made in 1880, when a convocation of scholars came together at Westminster and produced what is known as the Oxford Version; but this was done under a special restriction, namely, that "the style of language must be closely followed," in consequence of which it has met with so little acceptance that the former version is still in general use. So it happens that we have no Bible in the current vernacular, but are still reading from one expressed in the language of three centuries ago.

Now there are many things to be said for the King James Version:

First, as to its accuracy. Its occasional faults and infelicities are so unimportant as to leave its trustworthiness unimpaired. It is, indeed, a very miracle of accuracy. The scholars who assembled in 1880 to revise it were amazed to find how few and insignificant were the changes required by three hundred years of progress. Not a single error was discovered that affected its integrity in any way. God forbid that the writer who, during a ministry of fifty years, has drunk of this living stream and taught others so, should for a moment shake the faith of the humblest believer in the Bible as he has it!

Second, the Authorized Version is expressed in the stately and mellifluous tongue of the golden age of English literature. This is conceded and deeply appreciated by all scholars who love "the well of English undefyled." But it does not make for clarity in our time. Christ, the incarnate Word, would doubtless have been a more imposing figure had He appeared in purple and fine linen, wearing a crown or a halo; but He came down to our level and was clad in homespun, that He might win the common people by showing Himself to be a man among men.

Third, the Authorized Version is endeared to Christians by its long continued use and happy associations. This also is conceded; but unfortunately it has no such associations for those who are unfamiliar with it, *and these are the people whom we are trying to win*. Our memories run fondly back to "the old oaken bucket, the iron-bound bucket, the moss-covered bucket that hung in the well;" but the thirsty traveler would just as soon drink from any convenient spring. What the average non-Christian wants is a cool and refreshing draught of the water of life. Nevertheless the fact remains that the English-speaking people have no authoritative Bible in the dialect of these days.

Are there good and sufficient reasons for advocating such a revision as would render our otherwise most admirable version into current English? The writer thinks so.

First, because the sixty-six parts of the Bible, produced at various times during a period of sixteen hundred years, were all originally written in this way. Moses and the prophets addressed the people in the language which they were accustomed to speak. So did Christ during His ministry. He did not preach

in Hebrew or Greek, but in Aramaic, a hybrid tongue. Why so? Because this was the form of speech in common use, and He wanted the people to understand Him. Wherefore it is written: "The common people heard him gladly." And why was it that when He quoted from the Scriptures it was not from the Hebrew but from the Septuagint? Because this, whatever its drawbacks, was the version of the Old Testament in common use. The apostles in like manner wrote the Gospels and the Epistles not in classical Greek but in the more familiar dialect known as "the vulgar tongue."

Second, the Bible as originally written was adjusted to the progress of succeeding ages, and a vernacular translation is necessary in order to keep it so. Progress is a fact, but the moving world has not moved an inch away from the truth of the Scriptures as they were divinely given to men. Art and science and philosophy have developed nothing which was not forecast in the Bible as it left the hands of the inspired writers. But there have been changes in the forms of human speech which, while they in no wise affect the integrity of the Book, must be duly recognized if the Book is to be kept in line with the logic of events. The first edition of Webster's Dictionary, published in 1828, contained about seventy thousand words; the last edition contains above four hundred thousand. Is this improvement in facility of expression to be ignored in the propagation of the Scriptures? What an opportunity is here, not for the alteration of one jot or tittle of their content, but for giving a clearer and simpler avenue of approach to the mind of the average man.

Third, the Bible as originally written was everybody's Book; and it should be so presented to the people that everybody shall be able with the greatest possible ease to read and comprehend it. This Book was not intended for any exclusive junta of philologists or hermeneutical experts but for all sorts and conditions of men. A version in the language of the Elizabethan era is not easy reading for those who are unaccustomed to it. We who were born and bred in Christian households where "the old ha' Bible" was in constant use find no difficulty with its antique form of expression; but there are multitudes who are unnecessarily puzzled by it.

Not long ago a man just out of Sing Sing asked me to advise him how to build himself up in a Christian life. I referred him to the Book, using the words of the Master: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and these are they which testify of me." He thereupon undertook to read and study it systematically but presently returned with this complaint: "It's hard reading, Domine. You know how I was brought up; and when a fellow has spent twenty years in a cell eight by four he's not all there. I can read Nick Carter and the newspapers, but somehow this Book staggers me."

Yet this is the very sort of man to whom the blessed Book should make its strongest appeal. It is in his behalf that I plead for a version stripped of all antique words and phrases and couched in the language of our common life.

Fourth, we are, in my judgment, greatly handicapped by having to work with a tool forged three centuries ago. Why should we require our Bible societies to furnish all the peoples of the earth with

the Scriptures in the vernacular—except our own? When Jacob Chamberlain went to India the first thing he did was to provide the natives with a Bible in the common tongue. All the foreign missionaries do it. But our city missionaries go down to “the submerged tenth” and home missionaries to the unchurched masses on our remote frontiers, hampered by the necessity of presenting God’s Word in a beautiful but unfamiliar dialect which was spoken three centuries ago!

Suppose I were to use such venerable words and phrases in my preaching, what would my congregation think of it? Let no one misunderstand me. I am not finding fault with the accuracy of the King James Version, but with its antique style. We who are acquainted with it are naturally devoted to it. In this blessed Book we find our salvation, because the luminous shadow of the cross falls over it. Here we find the secret of sanctification or growth in character; as Jesus said in His sacerdotal prayer: “Sanctify them in the truth: thy word is truth.” And here we have our equipment for service in the holy war, as it is written: “Take * * * the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.”

Fifth, in case of a revision of the Authorized Version into the vernacular we should not only have our old Bible reduced to current speech, but, by the advantage of three centuries of constructive scholarship, we should doubtless approach more nearly to the Scriptures in their original form; and this is a consummation most devoutly to be wished.

One of the singular things about the Bible is that, while we insist upon the last edition of all other books, we want the first edition, or “original autograph,” of

A FEW HINTS ABOUT READING THE BIBLE

By PRINCIPAL P. T. FORSYTH, M. A., D. D., Hackney College,
Hampstead, London

IN reading the Bible we meet difficulties at the outset. It comes to us from another race and one very different. It comes to us from a remote and comparatively rude time. It comes to us from a race narrow in many respects, not hospitable to the thought or religion of other nations, and especially of those pagan nations that have so deeply influenced us—Greece and Rome. Its spirit seems alien to the modern mind with its debt to classic civilization and European culture.

We must face the action of critical science on the book itself. In this inquiring spirit we may lose the impression of freshness, simplicity, beauty, and saving power which the uncritical reader finds there.

The Bible is a religious book, and one which not only takes religion very much in earnest, but makes even more of grace than of religion. A great many of us are not religious, and when we are, we do not take our religion seriously enough; or we take it with a wrong seriousness—with an egotistic, making religion too subjective or too sentimental. To such the Bible seems either overstrung or obscure.

The Bible, being so objective and creative, is a storehouse of theology, and the temper of the time is against theology, even among Christians. Hence the Bible is neglected as if it were chiefly a theological book instead of a sacramental book for the human race and for the conscience of the race.

We are now asked to recognize a number of other sacred books, some not long discovered, and taking a high place in comparative religion.

I bear these things in mind when I offer such counsels as these about reading the Bible.

1. Do not read it promiscuously, a passage here one day, a bit there the next. I do not say this will do you no good; but it will do you some harm. It will not do you the Bible's best good; it is not fair to it. It is not a single book but a library, and treatment like that is not fair even to a single book if it be a great one. The Bible is the record of a long historical development, and to hop from part to part, backward and forward, will fill you with many confusions and doubts which consecutive reading would avoid. I wish Sunday School lessons were always arranged on this principle, though there has been much improvement in this respect. Much of course may be omitted, but what is kept should be kept in something like historic order. And especially is this rule useful in the case of the separate books. Even if you leap from book to book, finish one book before you take up another. Spend days or weeks at a time in the spiritual climate of one writer and one work. If you go to Switzerland for strength you do not go for a day. You make as many weeks as you can of it. So with the bracing air of Scripture. Live in one district long enough to rest there, to get its benefit, and to feel its spell. Then you come to know it, you possess it, you are built up upon it, and it is amply worth your while. And within each book ministers might preach more on long passages, and unfold their spiritual dialectic, with some care not to import their own or that of the seventeenth century.

and pages proceed detract greatly from the possibilities of lucidity. One needs a considerable previous acquaintance with the facts of church history in order to appreciate the excellencies of Professor Walker's work, and must himself supply a broad background of detail of information in order to maintain an unflagging interest.

The book is a model of the printer's art. Its typographical qualities add materially to one's pleasure in its perusal, and many a reader will feel himself to be indebted both to the author and to the publisher.

JAMES COFFIN STOUT.

ARAM AND ISRAEL¹

THIS study of the Aramaeans in Syria and Mesopotamia was issued in the spring of the present year. It is the thirteenth volume in the series of Oriental Studies edited by Professor Richard J. A. Gottheil under the auspices of the University. The author dedicates the book in a simple and affectionate way to "his parents, first and best of teachers."

He disclaims modestly any ability to write a genuine history of the Aramaeans, since "Through the gloom that enshrouds their destinies our sources only now and then cast a fitful glimmer." "Flashlight pictures, taken here and there, and preserved in papyri or engraved on stone or written on clay" must be pieced together by the chronicler. For "of the Aramaeans we know just enough to give an impressionist design of who they were and what befell them." And the author undertakes "to give merely an account of the fate of the Aramaeans so far as it is entwined with the destiny of the Chosen People."

Dr. Kraeling has gone to the original sources, so far as these exist. He confines his investigations to the period of Assyrian rule, ending with the fall of Nineveh, 606 B.C. The old Aramaic inscriptions of that early period come from northern and central Syria, such as the inscriptions of Aramaean kings of the eighth century B.C., discovered at the foot of the Amanus range, and the stele of Zakir, king of Hamath on the River Orontes. Few such monuments have come down to us. And

¹Aram and Israel (Vol. XIII, Columbia University Oriental Studies), by Emil G. H. Kraeling. New York, 1918. Pp. 155.

we are dependent chiefly on contemporaneous records in other tongues, almost entirely on the cuneiform records of Babylonia and Assyria. Archaic inscriptions from Nippur dated by archeologists in the third millennium B.C., letters of the Hammurapi dynasty and the Amarna age (or as we would say, between the times of Abraham and Moses), later monuments of the various Shalmanesers and Tiglathpileasers, are the main sources of information as to the history and geography of the Aramaean states.

The author puts next in importance to these sources the Old Testament. The value of its testimony he discounts to some extent because of his acceptance of the critical theory of the Old Testament history and literature, "made in Germany" and still swaying the liberal circles of thought. He thinks that "the exact nature of the events" narrated in the Old Testament "cannot always be fully determined, because most of the documents are quite far removed from the happenings that they narrate," and "the historical reminiscences concerning Aram's relations to Israel preserved in this great treasury of ancient lore are seldom contemporaneous" (p. 4). The fact that "the Hebrew writers did not aspire to write a history of the heathen peoples round about" and that "when they refer to them, it is merely a matter of accident," makes it necessary to "use the Old Testament traditions with the greatest of care." And he suggests that "the accuracy of their information needs to be closely examined," and that "no scholar would presume to make these traditions the basis of a history" (p. 5). In cases "where the account or internal evidence can be shown to be close in point of time to the events related, the standard of accuracy is usually very great. For the writers of Hebrew history were not, like the Assyrian scribes, official chroniclers bent on glorifying their sovereigns. They did not shrink from describing disasters and defeats." On the other hand, however, "their religious bias often, as in the case of Ahab, prevented them from giving a correct estimate of personalities" (p. 4).

The author's study of Ahab in relation to Aram contains no specifications of fact to sustain this charge of religious bias. On the contrary, he mentions the difficulty of harmonizing with our Old Testament narration the account given by the Assyrian inscription of a battle in which Ahab was involved, and says:

2. Read the Bible, as a record of the past, with historic sense and feeling. It belongs to the literature of power and sympathy rather than of knowledge. Read it with historic and spiritual sympathy. Cast yourself back into its native spiritual climate. You should not apply to it directly the habits and ideas of an age like our own. You should read it with sympathetic imagination, with the simplicity of mind in which it arose. This is particularly needful in the case of the Old Testament and its earlier parts. Its speech is the speech of the heart, you must read it with the heart's *naïvete*. Even in the case of the New Testament you must not forget that you are dealing with the infancy of the church. You have the records of experience rather than of reflection, and experience is the key to their understanding. Armed with the sympathies of religious experience, you will understand the figurative language in which much of the Bible is written. You will feel that it is the best language. Be careful with paraphrases which put the grand old language into modern Western, abstract terms. It is much truer to our experience to say: "The Lord is my shepherd," than to say: I believe in special providences. That figurative language is the universal language, the primitive language, the heart speech, understood of all.

And do not go to the Bible looking for those elegancies of style and delicacies of thought which a classical training leads us to expect, or our modern literature finds indispensable. These things are in the Bible, but they are incidental. Its model of style is not the lucid and the classic. Its feelings are simple; its style is not. And translation has sometimes beclouded obscurity and hardened difficulty.

Beautiful as Scripture is, and one of the wittiest books in the world, it is not for wit nor beauty's sake it is there. It is religion, not art, that inspires it. It is the truth of nature (though the new nature) rather than of art, the truth of emotion too deep to be always exact about its mode of expression.

To enter the Kingdom of Heaven you must become as a little child; and it is so with the Bible, which is its passport. It is in great part the speech of men in whom the religious emotions were as fresh and natural as the thoughts of a child. It is very true that the Epistles of Paul and the book of Revelation are not simple in the same sense as the narrative of Genesis, the outpourings of the Psalms, or the morality of the prophets. But it is still true that in form they belong to the infancy of Christian thought and imagination. Their form is not the *form* that comes natural to a late age and a different land like our own. Yet the substance is as compact as an acorn. You must not only read but expand it if you are right soil. You must do your best to translate the ideas of Paul and John into the native thought of our own day without debasing them. To bandy Paul's phrases is of little use. We must—especially the preacher must—translate them, not out of Greek into English, but out of some forms of thought that marked Paul's age into the forms that are intelligible to our own. Paraphrases of Scripture are apt to flatten it more than they simplify it. Let us get the best translation we can and read that if we want to read the Bible indeed. But we must then translate into our personal experience and our familiar thought, and not that of our age. We must distinguish between the garment of thought distinctive of the New Testa-

ment age and the substantial ideas in it which in various forms are true for all ages, and which therefore are not mere theories but powers.

He who would the poet know
To the poet's land must go.

This is why the soul of the Bible can never be got at without Christian experience and prayer. You need to get to that close and direct contact with God in which the Bible writers stood before you can understand their words. You need, as I say, to read Scripture with the deepest historic sense. You need to cast off the habits and expectations bred by living in an age so worldly and artificial as our own. You need to know the profound simplicity of Christ, and constantly to recur to it, in order to place yourself at the Bible point of view. There is no commentary on the Bible like Christian struggle, Christian experience, Christian prayer. For that alone puts you in the Bible air, and teaches you the true Bible tongue. The Bible becomes a living book to those who have knowledge of the living God. The Gospels speak the tongue of the present day because they speak the tongue of an ever present Christ. To understand the history of Christ we must feel the Christ in history—in the world's history and our own. To find the leading motive in His life we must ask what in Him has chiefly affected the church. He is the key to the Book which is the key of all books. We must come to this Bible in the spirit that grows up in all who really frequent Christ's society—in the fluid, flexible, glowing, sympathetic, imaginative spirit of a love which takes quiet possession of our whole being. The hard and literal and unhistoric mind is not Christian. And it is that mind which is the source

of so many difficulties about religion and the Bible. The authority for the Bible is the Gospel of reconstruction which called it into being, and gives it its reason for being there.

3. You are to read the Bible, moreover, with the spirit of humble inquiry and free mind. You are to *search* the Scriptures with all the eagerness bred by a passionate appreciation of their contents. You want to know everything about what you love. The Bible is not only to be enjoyed, but so far as we can, to be understood. It is not an object of blind worship. It will open our eyes for us if we will not do it for ourselves before coming to it.

The devoted Bible reader should possess some annotated edition. He need not go to the extent of a commentary; that is for more special students. But there are many allusions to be explained and obscurities to be cleared up by a few judicious words. The minister finds that in pulpit reading. All that is necessary can be compressed into notes in the margin or at the bottom of the page. Such notes at the end are not good. You have to turn them up, and that is not good for anyone who is chiefly eager to get the direct impression of the passage in hand. The great thing is to get the Bible meaning as rapidly, directly, and truly as possible, the stamp of the writer's soul on yours with all possible freshness and force. Let us only get the pure Scripture meaning, and after that we can proceed to discuss it in such way as we desire. But the true meaning, please, first. Almost all the popular difficulties about the Bible spring out of misunderstandings of the Bible—misunderstandings, some of them, very fashionable, and very venerable.

So read your Bible as you love your God with all your heart and soul and strength and mind. You must come with piety, with imagination, with the best helps you can get from competent scholars and critics, with the highest passion for fresh light, and the highest power of the light that is old. And you must come to the Bible not as a book you take up to pass a quarter of an hour, but with strength, with earnestness, with reverence, not with the spirit of skepticism uppermost, but the spirit of faith, sympathy, and love. It is one of those books whose contents you cannot even challenge with due effect in detail unless you are in tune with them as a whole.

The Bible will take a higher and mightier place than it has ever yet had. All ancient classics are coming to be understood as they never were before, and to be proportionately influential. Even if the Bible were no more than these, it would take a new lease of life. But it is much more, and its destiny is much more. So long as we are Christians the Bible will remain the chief source of our religious nutriment and the chief agent of the powers of His eternal world. It is the source not only of information but of impulse. It is the wellhead of a Spirit which will lead us into all truth *concerning Himself*. Just as the spirit of life in the body brings all its parts into due shape and perspective, so the Spirit of God in the Bible will throw the various elements in the Bible into their true place. The true Spirit has taught us that the Bible is a religious book, a book of spiritual creativeness, not of scientific theory.

4. While it is right enough that the Bible should be read critically by those who are competent to criticise, the Bible was not written in the first instance

for critics or criticism. If it had been it would have been written differently. It is one of those books which presuppose a sympathetic spirit. Was Homer written for the philologists or psychologists? Not for them as such, but for the poetic soul. So the Bible flowed from the religious soul, and to the soul of large and generous religion it appeals. "Read the Bible like any other book," we are told. Yes, but like any book *of the same kind*. Then you will find there is no other of the kind. It is a book that kindles, nay, creates. It makes a new man; it does not just exalt the old. If the Bible has never kindled you, are you in a position which entitles you to any worthy opinion about it? Its atmosphere is not the atmosphere of science but of music. Other writers may develop the *science* of religion; the Bible utters its *sound* to all the earth.

If any of you have come to apply your small and amateur criticism to the Bible till it is in your hands like a squeezed lemon, you must go through a renewing of your youth. You must get back your heart, you must recover your soul, you must, ere it be well with you, come to view this Book as a rich fruit, fresh and full, upon the tree of life. Shakespeare is set for examinations, and read in our schools and colleges for the sake of his English, till he is murdered by dissection, and you never care to lift a play again when your drudgery is done. That is not criticism. True criticism is something much more appreciative and constructive. It is like fine cookery; but this is stewing it to rags. Shakespeare created life; he made men and women. The genuine student of Shakespeare sits down with him and lives in his world, converses with his heart, follows his characters, and

is roused, or melted, or awed, or cast into the laughter deep and still. So in the more solemn and imperious case of the Bible.

You must love him ere to you
He shall seem worthy of your love.

It is not a political harangue you have in the Bible, in which you are to watch for points to trip your opponent up. The Lord's controversy with man is not a debate. The Word of God speaketh through the Bible as unto sons. It is a Father speaking to His child. It is the soul's bridegroom speaking to the soul, the bride. Who can quibble over lovers' talk? Who can answer eternity? And it is eternity that sounds in the ripples and the billows of that grand sea of glass mingled with fire.

5. Ah, you say, this man would have us back into the old mischievous tone of Bible worship. How is it that those preachers lose their mental balance in this way? If they were only a little more men of the world, and learnt to keep their judgment while their religion grows! What is the use of talking in this extravagant style about the Bible?

Well, go to your Shakespeare societies, your Goethe societies, your Browning societies, your universities where Homer is enthroned in classic reverence. Will you not hear from these quarters praise, and almost idolatry, of their patron poet which it would be very easy to turn to cheap city ridicule? Have these scholars lost their judgment? Do you ever stop to ask whether it is probable that these great geniuses should show their power chiefly by turning their students into idiots and babblers? Whence comes this admiration of theirs that seems to you so extravagant, so unworthy of the noble level and final standard

of the penny press? Is it not more rational to suppose that through each of these great spirits there flows the echo and revelation of the mighty powers which preside over life, and act in its sublime silences and in its ironic laughter over the fool who hath said in his heart: There is no great deep? Some may of course find the mighty unseen powers, which shape life and confound the fribble, speaking to them more loudly and intelligibly in one genius than in another. But the feeling is there—the feeling that Shakespeare or Goethe, as the case may be, has brought the power of the profound and solemn world to bear on their spirits and raised them to the presence of life and death indeed. Under the spell of the world's awe, beauty or mirth, we speak with gratitude and in no measured terms of those gifted souls who both see and make us to see things before which we quail and ideals to which we arise and shine for the light that is come.

Well, if that is so, are we to speak in stunted praise and moderate terms of His Book who made both life and genius? Are we to speak feebly of the Book that is inspired by Him who framed life, ordered its powers, created Shakespeare to be His messenger, Milton His minister, and Goethe His servant; who Himself is the power behind all life's solemnities, the glory behind all its passion, and the grace beyond and above all its grace of pathos and tender tones; who has sent forth here not one genius but many, transcended them in His Son, and anointed them with an intimate unction denied to the large brow of Shakespeare, or Homer's universal wand? No praise lavished on any book is enough for the praises of the Bible. But if you have no book at all that

you can praise with all your might it is not wonderful that the terms should be poor in which you praise the literature of a whole select nation, the record of a race's redemption, and the morning story of the soul's final faith.

6. But there is another vast difference between this Bible and the classics. They do not make you pray; the Bible does. They are aesthetical; the Bible is ethical and practical. The classics are works of art; and art is the companion of life, not its guide. These works are therefore not our guides in life, much as they enlarge it and adorn. But the Bible is a guide, both among men and especially to God. It teaches both ethic and worship, and worship most of all. We cannot honor it more than by making it our prayer book, by converting our reading into lesson, and our lesson into prayer. When the full force of it comes home it forces us to pray. It provides the very phraseology. Its very stories can shape our prayers, as its power kindles them.

Protestantism is not so rich in books of devotion as Catholicism, and the reason is that its Bible in every hand is its great manual of prayer. We do not pray over Homer, or even Aeschylus, or Plato. We might, but they do not move us, do not cheer, do not force us to it. How differently the two act is expressed in Charles Lamb's fine saying: "If Shakespeare came into this room we should all stand up, but if Christ came in we should all kneel down." The great figures in the Bible are men of prayer. The greatest force man can exert, according to the Bible, is the force that turns God's hand—prayer. Christ gave the greatest value to prayer as an engine for the Kingdom of God. But the great products of art

do not leave us in the region of prayer; they may take us to the frontier. We are pacified and uplifted—for a time, but that is not prayer. They might move a breath of prayer, but they do not create its atmosphere. The message in them is not the kind that creates prayer, only elation; it is not grace, creating the faith that must pray. The last secret of the Bible is not a new piety, but a new creation.

The grace of the beautiful does not affect us like the grace of holiness. For the grace of holy love did something, and it makes us do something in response. It moves us to that greatest form of action—prayer. But the grace of loveliness is not the grace of love. It only shows itself and we contemplate raptly; it does not redeem us so that we trust forever and without ceasing pray. That is what the Bible does when we give it its way with us. And no other book does it. And no number of cases where it fails to do that affects the value of those cases innumerable where it does.

7. No external or traditional veneration can pay due tribute to a book like the Bible. The source of the faith which is superstition's deadliest foe can be honored by nothing superstitious. No claim for infallibility can suit the genius of this Book unless it do still more honor to the infallibility of that Spirit whose revelation it strives to record. Its work is not to arrest or detain upon itself the worship due to Him whose tool and organ it is. All that the Bible demands is to be approached in the Spirit from which it came forth.

The servants of God who gave it us were not men who stopped to argue points of literature, science, philosophy or art. They got inside all these. They

were men with the burden, the message, the demand, the Gospel of God. They were men who lived in the sublimities of an imperious law, or in the burning depths of an irresistible love. They were men of the passionate moral reason, of the large and understanding heart. They speak as unto wise men, and to such they cry: Judge ye what I say. It was not to the learned, it was not to the scribe, it was not to the priest, their message came. It was to the world—to the soul of the world. This is the world's Book, humanity's Book. It goes to the world's conscience. It is the charter of the world's destiny. Sin is no national peculiarity. Love is no national longing. Redemption is not the cry of antiquity alone. And sorrow is not the wail of a vexed handful of men. God and His living Word do not go forth to a favored few. These are world ideas, world needs, world gospels, world powers, and powers of a world to come.

This Book is for each soul as no other book is or can be. It reaches us and finds us when no other can follow into the depths of our nature or carry solace to the fever of our need. It is very much more than a cheery book. It is not for our comfortable critical hours alone; it is for hours too solemn to let any other book near, and for moods too dark and distempered to yield to any but its healing light. Enjoy it first; criticise it after. Of all criticism the most safe and fruitful is what springs from love.

Search the Scriptures, but let them at least be Scriptures to you first. Let them be *sacraments*, not mere *documents*. How shall you search for treasure to any purpose in a region where you have no reason to know that there is any hidden wealth?

The first eyes to turn on the Bible are those eyes behind the eyes—the eyesight of the soul. The Book will not speak its own true tongue to you till you begin to inquire of it about its own spirit and soul. You must advance, upon reasonable trust, the capital of sympathy which you are to receive a hundredfold. You must go out to meet this Book. You must, when it finds you, be on the road it travels. And you must go forth in the spirit of hospitality, nay, of reverence, for you must say: I am not worthy thou shouldst come under my roof. Who ever won the secrets of Nature that treated Nature with contempt, that refused to wait upon her, and to haunt her secret places for her hidden riches? Who can expect the favors of a guest to whose coming he is indifferent or averse? To whom can his Bible open up who has not the spirit of the Bible in his heart, to the extent at least of tuning his soul to the Bible's mood, and loving most the things the Bible loves? This Book delivers its message to human-hearted, godly-minded men. It is a world in itself, with all the variety and all the inequalities of a world within it. And God hath set the world in our heart; He has gifted us with the great common passions, affections, and ideas, with the energies, hopes, powers, and tragedies that make man man. To these the Bible comes, a world to a world, bringing God to His sons that as sons they might return to God. We must drink deep of this wine ere we can taste its true flavor and criticise its quality. You must inhale this spirit, as the wind on the eternal hills, in great inspirations. They are no narrow questions that are handled here. The narrow mind is bewildered and helpless in such regions.

This Book is the true book of fate, of life and death, of the eternal before and the eternal hereafter. It is by our behavior toward the truth of this Book that we are justified or condemned at last. It has God's height in it, the breadth of Heaven, the depth of hell, the final destinies of the human soul, and the one revelation of its Saviour. It is the Book of humanity because it is the Book of eternity. It is the Book of the Kingdom of God because it cares for righteousness more than peace, for a world's righteousness more than for a people's peace.

THE PROBLEM OF HEBREW POETRY

I

By REV. RAYMOND A. BEARDSLEE, B. D., Pastor First Congregational Church, Springfield, Vermont.

THE HEBREW DRAMATIC GENIUS

THE crown of the Old Testament is its poetry. If compelled to choose, we could sacrifice the prose; but the poetry, sublime in content and expression, contains so much of the thought and theology, the ethics and philosophy, the spirit and genius and soul, of the Hebrew race, that we could not spare it. Indeed, nowhere in literature is the universal note so high, so sustained, and so positive as here, particularly among the Prophets and in the Psalms.

At the same time, this very body of poetry, once discovered, has been the Waterloo of Old Testament scholarship. It is a field where the labor has been great and the harvest small. The baffled extravagance of earlier students gave way to the baffled caution of more recent scholars. Substantial success has been conspicuously lacking. No one has ever done, for example, for the songs of the Syrian Shepherd King, what Fitzgerald accomplished for the philosophical quatrains of the Persian Tentmaker. Instead, the latest works on Hebrew poetry are monuments of laborious but unconvincing experimentation, or of extended but insipid superficiality; our standard modern versions still fail to transfer the poetry of the original; and, where our public use of this material is most specialized (*i. e.*, in the Psalms) we are still content, either with a humdrum chanting, or else with

a quite misleading system of "responsive" readings which, frankly, do not consistently "respond," however violently they do alternate.

We have, therefore, a vague though justified feeling that Hebrew poetry is the crown of Hebrew literature. But we also feel that its English counterpart is a weak copy in faded colors, sadly bewraying the brilliance of the original. Nor do we feel that the professional students of Hebrew literature have succeeded in remedying the situation.

But the failure of Biblical scholarship to raise the translation of Hebrew poetry to its rightful primacy is by no means the fault of scholarship as such. The difficulty in handling the technical problem and the failure to discover the genius of Hebrew poetry run back into the age-long chasm between the heart of the Orient and the mind of the Occident. The East and the West have been forever aliens. Their ways of seeing things and expressing them have kept them racially incommensurate.

In a single word, the difference between them is mainly a matter of vividness. Speaking broadly, the Oriental peoples have such dramatic emotions and such direct and simple thought that they seem naturally to express themselves in picturesque and realistic ways which are to us often fantastic and sometimes greatly exaggerated. The child of the East adorns his words with a beauty and a variety of expression which Westerners can only imitate and never naturalize. Whatever the materialistic modern Jew may be, the ancient Hebrew was an Oriental in spirit as well as in blood. His dramatic instinct was as Orientally vivid and as variously expressed as that of an unspoiled modern Japanese. Like all of his national neigh-

bors, he looked at things with dramatic insight, felt their real power with vivid emotions, and interpreted his feelings with picturesque art. It is at bottom a matter of emotions and imagination—the power to picturize feelings.

The point is worthy of more than passing mention. The possession of this dramatic instinct accounts for a great many features of Hebrew life. Among others, *e. g.*, it molded his religious institutions. To the Hebrew's vivid conception of the one God is due, no doubt, his ultimate provision for a single sanctuary at which alone that God should be formally worshiped. Then, since no such sanctuary could be devised—or needed to be in that climate—large enough to cover all of the worshipers at once or even a small fraction of them, in personal participation, the service became necessarily a professional, vicarious, symbolic ritual. But this very ritual appealed most strongly to the same dramatic, imaginative instinct. To see, or even to imagine, the High Priest entering the sacred structure *for him* was more dramatic, *i. e.*, objective, to the Hebrew, than to enter himself; and the ceremony of the blood and smoke of the ancient sacrificial system was so concrete and visible that the highly imaginative Hebrew's relation to his God became thereby most vividly real. It looks, to be sure, indistinctly separated from the basis of idolatry—but it was distinctly Oriental.

This dramatic appeal to the imagination is, indeed, the characteristic of all religious pageantry and formal ritual, most distinctive in the Oriental outdoor atmosphere, less successful when imitated by those who are only under Oriental influences. Thus when the Greeks really worshiped they set their temple upon

an Acropolis and viewed it from a distance. It was a gem of perfect proportions, skilfully designed and erected with most exact corrections, all with the major purpose of furnishing something for the crowds to look at but not to enter. Too small to contain them all, they gazed upon it from without, its concrete beauty thrilling them with the reality, its distant hidden mysteries whispering to them of the awe, of their religion. Similarly, when the medieval heirs of the Greeks and Romans, living in a climate of unpropitious skies, bade their masons turn the colonnaded Grecian temple inside out, add arch to column, expand the floor, pierce the wall with windows, and cover all with the leaping vault of a protecting roof, in order that the thronging worshipers might be included inside the capacious sanctuary, even then the magnificent grandeur of the Gothic cathedrals was not devoid of the same emotional appeal as the more exquisite beauty of the Greek temple. And the medieval service, also, was essentially a dramatic spectacle, with its gorgeous procession of clerics, its solemn intonings, its bells and incense, its bowing and kneeling. All of this meant that professionals conducted the worshiping symbolically while the crowd looked on—the same old Oriental dramatic device for reaching the heart through the imagination. Strictly speaking, the present and former pageantry of the Roman Catholic liturgy is an exotic, that church counting its members mainly among peoples who are not Oriental or immediately influenced by Oriental heritage and environment—which may explain why it needs all the compulsion of an authoritative ecclesiastical backing for its perpetuation, and why, in spite of this, its real power as a service is waning.

But no true Oriental needs a papal decree to make him feel the power of a pageant, the Hebrew least of all. Like his Oriental neighbors, he had deep emotions and a keen imagination; in his own case, however, their depth and keenness were enhanced to the highest degree by the distinctly lofty spiritual character of his profoundly religious life. If we define the highest religion as that whose followers are most deeply moved by the highest truth, we cannot do less than accord the Hebrew religion the highest place, at least among its contemporaries. For under the inspiration of that surpassing faith, his wonderfully responsive imagination made the significance of the visible and the reality of the invisible alike vividly concrete and eloquently appealing to his every emotion. Those emotions, in turn, had been schooled by the most varied range of national experiences touching every chord of his nature from the highest exaltation of ambition crowned with success to the resentful lamentation born of oppression, and the abject despair of well-earned ruin.

Out of all this the Hebrew poetry was born, marvelous for concreteness and simplicity, for beauty and action, for vividness and nobility; instinctively dramatic, full of life, appealing to sympathetic emotions with native power because it came from vivid feelings deeply moved. Being mentally alert, the Hebrew saw everything with great distinctness; being mentally agile, he could report an experience from a dozen angles in quick succession, and find no difficulty whatever in what seem to us sharp contrasts and violent transitions. Vivid emotions and a vivid imagination gave him vivid power to picture his feelings. The result is a poetry distinctive in one respect and unique in another.

In the first place, Hebrew poetry was written *staccato*. Each line contains one thing. Every line is complete. The sentence and the line coincide; or, better, the thought and the line are one. The idea or picture or emotion to be expressed is simple, entire, and concrete, and it is expressed directly and briefly. Thus Hebrew poetry, line after line, rings like the blows of hammer upon anvil. No long involved thoughts and accumulated abstract phrases make the end of the sentence invisible from the beginning. In all of Hebrew poetry there is nothing like Milton's style in *Paradise Lost*. The Hebrews visualized their feelings, their ideas, and their observations, and made them distinct and concrete to their minds. When they gave expression to these things, they instinctively put the expression, too, in picturesque form which could be instantly visualized.

Moreover, the same *staccato* genius which makes the sentence short and whole makes also the poem itself prevailingly short. As every line can be visualized at a glance, so also the whole poem can be comprehended entire, and for the same reason. This explains why Job is broken into dialogues. It also reveals why the interminable 119th Psalm is stretched on the mechanical framework of the alphabet. The long poem is as foreign to the Hebrew poetry as is the long sentence. The *epos* and the drama, which are the Aryan's most distinctive successes, are quite unrepresented in Hebrew literature. These forms are too heavy, too sustained and huge, to be visualized at a glance. They are too complicated for a concrete mind. They are extended and massive rather than compact, narrative rather than picturesque, and analytic rather than expressional. The dramatically

imaginative Hebrew could not put his facts into poetry, but he could not help putting his feelings into poetical form. The facts of the Exodus would have made a mighty epic—for the Aryan; the keener dramatic instinct of the Hebrew left these and all his other facts in prose, reserving for the highest poetical form the expression of his emotional reactions to the facts of his experiences as he faced and felt the Providence which gave them their significance. The long poem, and the long sentence within the poem, are equally foreign to the Hebrew genius. Here every line is complete, like the facet of a diamond; and every line can be visualized, being the reflected transmutation of some single idea, or emotion, or thought. It is this which makes Hebrew poetry distinctive.

This leads directly to mention of the second feature, in the possession of which Hebrew poetry is unique.

Why should not a dramatic people, who have produced a dramatic poetry, put that poetry to dramatic use? Certainly it cannot be denied that these wonderful poems do lend themselves with peculiar aptness to public presentation in the form of dramatic interpretation. The Hebrew was no reader, for sufficient practical reasons; but he was a preëminent reciter. So far as we know, there was no institution like "the stage" in ancient Israel, nor were there professional actors. But the remarkable natural endowment of imagination and memory made every Hebrew a dramatic artist. Because he was dramatic himself his poetry was dramatic; and because both he and his poetry were dramatic he could stand before his fellows and interpret with rare effectiveness the

concrete expressions which made visible the deep feelings of their hearts and the clear visions of their minds.

Imagine—if it be not beyond the Occidental imagination—imagine the 23d or the 19th Psalm being dramatically interpreted, line by line, by the costume, pose or action, the inflection or gesture, of a skilful public reader before a typical Hebrew gathering. Imagine such sympathetic interpretation being accompanied by fitting music, with appropriate interludes in the major and minor pauses. Picture the whole performance, even, as being set against the real or imaginary background of the temple, suffused with the deep religious atmosphere of its feast seasons, and perhaps in many instances actually incorporated into its services. The spectators and auditors, then, are worshipers. As they watch and listen each line becomes a vivid picture before them, and every picture awakens, as it expresses, profound emotion. The spirit of the crowd is unified and lifted. Memories and emotions, faith and hope, chastened pride and rewarded humility, thanksgiving and expectation, penitence and prayer and rededication, move powerfully within them as David's Psalms, interpreted by David's spiritual impersonation, powerfully call to the truest depths of David's people.

If this seems fantastic it is because it is distinctly Oriental. It is almost inconceivable that such a marvelous flowering of religious emotions and dramatic expression could have been put to any but the very highest use. What is the "highest use" of poetry? Possibly there is no external feature in which the Occident and the Orient stand so far asunder as in their answer to that question. Indeed, moderns will

have to confess that they are practically lacking in any first-class art of public interpretation of poetry. The actor is a standard artist, but the use of poetry in the drama is but occasional at best and is probably on the wane. Aside from this, how do we use it? We megaphone it with music while the audience guesses the words or reads them out of a book. We sing it to popular and sacred songs, where the music is a pleasing mechanical method of solo or unison repetition, but not ordinarily an interpretation. Or we have the elocutionist, who tortures when he overdoes and bores when he falls short. At best he is not reckoned a first-class artist—and this not entirely because of his own inabilities but also, and perhaps mainly, on account of the limitations of his materials and his audience. For the dramatic possibilities of a short poem, the Aryan seems to have no native instinct. So when we come even to our highest poetical literature, we leave it mainly in the books. And when we do succeed in liberating it from the library, we content ourselves with bare vocal reading, unison or antiphonal repetition, singing, chanting or intoning. These are the common uses of our religious poetry, but our highest use is commonplace when compared with dramatic interpretation such as those suggested.

After all, what is the highest art form, using "highest" in the pragmatic sense of "most effective to express or awaken human emotions"? Pure music is not the highest, nor music wedded to words, though some things there may be capable of no other expression. Nor is it painting or sculpture. Certainly it is not architecture, even when it is "sacred." All of these suffer under physical limitations; they appeal to life, but they are not living. The writer of book

prose, in turn, must yield the plume to the writer of book poetry, while both must confess their limitations at once in the presence of the orator's and the preacher's sway. All of the foregoing are powerful art forms and each has its sphere. But in the art of the actor art reaches its apex, as he lives out life itself, with all its emotions made visible in self-revealing words and acts. Nothing surpasses this for the expression of feeling and for the awakening of sympathetic answering emotions. But among the huger forms of tragedy and comedy the dramatic short poem stands supreme in possibilities—a precious stone among a collection of rocks, and a diamond among the precious stones. This is the highest use of poetry, and this use of poetry for religious purposes is the highest art form there is. Such are the public possibilities of the Psalms. As Wendell Phillips cannot but be read aloud, and as Shakespeare cannot but be staged, at least mentally, so Hebrew poetry cannot but be visualized and read *dramatically*.

It is entirely possible that some sort of dramatic recitation of many of these poems became standardized and traditional, much as, in our modern hymnology, words and music have become traditionally wedded. Thus even the solitary reader of the written words, or, more typically, the lone traveler repeating the poem from memory, saw with the mind's eye somebody reciting the lines to the familiar dramatic interpretation.

It is also quite within the range of likelihood that the later Hebrews read their economically condensed manuscripts with all of this in mind, as we read our Hamlet after seeing Booth. The written word was only a shorthand record, intended to guarantee the

verbal accuracy of the current public tradition or to preserve the verbal remains of a discontinued art. All that unlimited range of imagination and artistic device, the accumulated tradition of the interpretation of the words manifestly does not lend itself to being recorded, whether in Psalms or in Shakespeare. It is carried in the mind, learned first as a spectator, and, later, perhaps, by the imitation or inspired origination of the participant. This art and tradition of the public performance of the poems would vary somewhat with the personalities of the interpreters. But the words must stand. For the initiated, for purposes of teaching, and for historical preservation, the compactest form of writing the words was quite sufficient. This is practically all that the Hebrew Scriptures afford to this day—a record, fairly pure, of the verbal contents of a highly dramatic religious literature. We see the words; their contemporaries visualized also the art which interpreted the words and the ritual background which gave them color.

Painters have drawn upon Bible sources for their grandest subjects, and musicians have enshrined its words in a noble body of song. Architects have fixed its spirit and its memories in stone temples, and orators have voiced its appeals in living words. In these activities even the ancients cannot surpass us. But why is the Bible so seldom acted, particularly the Biblical poetry? The attempt to do it might have saved us many years of weary waiting for the clue to that poetry. Possibly the dramatic use of short poems is an art so high that the gifted Hebrews themselves held that level for only a short time. Certainly the Occidental has never risen to the point of producing such a body of his own, or of acting that of others.

But the bare possession of that quality, even though never so used, is what makes Hebrew poetry unique and supreme, the crown of Hebrew literature.

The sympathetic visualization of the lines is the key to the poetical problem of the Old Testament. It is an internal and not an external solution, because, contrary to the Western ways, the genius of that Eastern poetry is in its contents and not in its outward mechanical form.

DRAMATIC INTERPRETATION OF HEBREW POETRY

Hearing a school boy read Hamlet is one thing. Seeing Edwin Booth act out that tragedy was quite another matter. Having seen Booth, Hamlet becomes a new thing, and Shakespeare can never be read again with the same eyes as before. Somewhat similarly a dramatic interpretation of two of the most familiar Psalms may set the whole subject of Hebrew poetry in a new light. Would that the genius of a Booth were available for the task!

Take, for example, the 19th Psalm. Imagine a beautiful woman in the simple symbolic robes of Wisdom, standing beneath the open sky in the early hours of dusk, the quiet meeting-point of day and night. She takes her position at one side of the open space that serves her as a stage. Then let her begin to interpret with solemn art the appealing eloquence and profound wisdom of the processional hours of daylight and dark and the all-embracing range of Heaven's voice.

- 1 The heavens declare the glory of God,
And the firmament sheweth his handiwork.
- 2 Day unto day uttereth speech,
And night unto night sheweth knowledge.

- 3 They have no speech nor language;
 They make no sound that is heard.
 4 Yet their message carries throughout the earth,¹
 And their words to the end of the world.

Let her picture the symbolic glory, the power, mystery, and ardor of the recurrent sun—outstanding feature of every day from glowing dawn to glorious dusk.

- 5 In them hath he set a dwelling for the sun,
 Which cometh out of his chamber like a bridegroom,
 And rejoiceth in his course like a strong man.
 6 His start is from one end of the sky,
 And his return is to its farthest bound,
 And there is nothing hidden from the heat thereof.

Then let her pause, and slowly turn, and watch the entrance, from the opposite side, of one attired as a Pharisee, who takes his central place and, referring to the whole body of God's instructive revelation, recites:

- 7 The Law of God is perfect, turning souls from sin.
 Another figure enters attired as a scribe, and, standing by the first, refers to the legal code contained in that revelation and recites:

The Code of God is sure, a school for innocents.
 A pause, and a third character, an elder, with measured step gravely takes his place in the row, his wise and kindly face witnessing to his lifelong experience touching the separate commandments of the Law, as he recites:

- 8 The Rules of God are right, a comfort to the heart.
 Quickly a fourth is added to the line, the stirring prophetic figure of a very Elijah, who typifies God's special commissions (not his "commandments" but

¹"Their line" (A. V.) is the *measuring-line* which measures how far their message carries and what is the range of their (inaudible) "voice."

His personal commands) to chosen individuals, and he recites:

The Call of God is clear, enkindling flashing eyes.

A fifth appears, in the sacred robes of the priesthood, symbolic of the holy majesty which invests all of God's messages to men, and he recites:

9 The Awe of God is spotless, standing fast for aye.

Completing the row comes the judge, veteran of a thousand trials, personification of the verdict of righteousness, to confess:

The Court of God is righteous, the very heart of Truth.

Then, in the ensuing pause, let the accompanying music change to royal strains, while a figure, clad and crowned as David himself, enters and stands opposite Wisdom. An impressive sweep of the hand, including all the figures that preceded him and which now stand between Wisdom and himself, accompanies his assertion that all wealth and every luxury are not to be compared with these characters who personify the source of all his own prudence and the crown of his own life. These—God's Word, the code it contains, the separate rules of the code, the special commissions, the attendant sanctity, and the final awards—are

10 More desirable than gold—or much fine gold.

Sweeter than honey—or even honey-syrup—

11 By such is thy servant warned, keeping them brings great reward.

These, with God's mercy and restraint to guard and free him from blunders and deceptive sins and from the unavoidable mistakes of unconscious overconfidence, shall make him perfect, his words acceptable and his meditation welcome, before God, his Gibraltar and his Redeemer.

The dramatic possibilities of the 23d Psalm are even more striking, using the literal words exactly as they stand. In the blinding, chilling mists of early dawn crouches a figure huddled in a heap upon the ground, alone, covered loosely by a shepherd's coat, yet trembling violently with fear, hunger, and cold. The sound of one unseen startles him. He turns tensely to listen. Straining eye and ear cannot pierce the mist in the gray half-light. Yet the one unseen approaches. Shall it be friend or foe? The crouching figure struggles to one knee. With difficulty he rises to his feet and peers about. Finally, an upward sweep of the hand as though brushing aside the darkness, and there it is—the Shepherd! seen and recognized before his dim and tearful eyes with infinite relief:

1 It is the Lord! My Shepherd!

Slowly the hands drop—and fold. The eyes, too, fall. And his faith, rebuked and revived, confesses that anything but plenty, with such a Shepherd, is inconceivable:

I shall not want.

Then, as the morning mists rise slowly, the rolling meadows unfold. The lifted eye surveys them all. The sweeping hand embraces them, and the lips eagerly remark their refreshing vistas:

2 In green pastures²

And then, with infinite tenderness, as though now he himself were the wise Shepherd, his strong hands gently lay their imaginary burden in the soft sheltered spot which his eye had chosen:

He lays me down.

²Following the Hebrew order strictly. "In green pastures" precedes "He maketh me to lie down."

These four glimpses of his throbbing heart, as the silent weary Shepherd had laid him there, trembling, hungry, and tired, in the midst of abundance and personal protection, make a perfect quatrain. Each glimpse is a complete picture, even though expressed in a single word. Each picture is a dramatic unit, and the four together make a single unified stanza.

And then the immediate present fades away. A second quatrain follows, more significant than the first, living over again, step by step, what had preceded this scene of the early dawn. This foolish beloved heart had been missed at the evening round-up, but sought all night, finally found, and only now at last restored to the well-known paths and the rendezvous at the grateful spring, by a Shepherd both loving and supremely jealous for his own honor, who else would not be worthy of his name:

3 (* * * *) Beside the still waters,
 He bringeth back my soul.
 He leadeth me in the right paths,
 For his name's sake.

The spring, the restoration, the right paths, and the Shepherd's mingled solicitude are the four distinct symbolic features, the dramatic units, of the stanza.

Again, both past and present fade away. A third quatrain carries the lesson of the recent experience on into the ultimate future. The lonely darkness of death will be even worse than the wild night just passed if faced, like that, alone. Yet such a solicitous Shepherd's kingly presence will banish every timid fear of imagined harm. Tottering uncertainly through that impenetrable gloom, his

*The word for "he leadeth me" is probably a dittographic interpolation. See line 3 of the same stanza.

groping fingers close upon a scepter and a staff steadied by invisible hands to steady his own. By these tokens he is known, and expected, and recognized, David, shepherd-lad and king. And, oh! the flooding boyhood memories and manhood visions and dying hopes they awaken for his comfort!

4 Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death,
I will fear no evil,
For (* * * ') with me are thy rod and thy staff,
They comfort me.

Four further lines express the exaltation of his reassured faith in even more figurative language, yet still in dramatic pictures. It is all like a triumphal banquet to celebrate a victory, with vanquished foes as witnesses, so great a vindication of the trustworthiness of faith is this whole experience. It is like a ceremonial of highest coronation, where jubilant plenty fills each cup to overflowing:

5 Thou preparest a table before me
In the very presence of mine enemies!
Thou anointest my head with oil,
My cup runneth over!

Finally a closing quatrain flashes before the imagination, in four more dramatic pictures, the high resolution and earnest dedication born of the night's experience and the morning's meditation. God's grace pursues His children the way a shepherd seeks a lost lamb. No single day without His watchful presence, nor will all the days of a long life exhaust His gracious love. Thus this child of His will stray no more in vain self-trust, but will make God's house his very home, until time itself shall end:

'The word for "thou art" is obviously an interpolation; the sense is quite complete without it.

6 Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me,
All the days of my life;
And I will dwell in the house of the Lord
The length of the days.

The interpretations of the lines as given in either of the poems above are by no means the only ones possible, nor are they necessarily the right ones. It is not intended, either, to imply that all the poetry in the Hebrew literature is as highly dramatic as the samples given. It is not even claimed dogmatically that such dramatic renderings as these were ever actually attempted. But it is very significant of the quality of these Psalms in particular that such dramatizations can be proposed. Indeed, we can even go so far as to say that the values of these poems cannot be adequately found without visualizing each picture in its own full vividness; and the pictures cannot be visualized without some such resultant dramatic reconstruction.

Wherever Hebrew poetry is found—in Hebrew song, Hebrew prophecy, Hebrew ritual, or Hebrew proverbs—it is everywhere distinctly Hebrew, which is to say, deeply dramatic. That universally present dramatic element is the standing characteristic of Hebrew poetry, at once its genius and its clue. The solution of this most vexing problem is therefore not to be found in lyric considerations or in ritualistic usage; for much of Hebrew poetry (*e. g.*, Isaiah or the introduction to Proverbs) was never part of the temple service and is incapable of being sung. Neither is the solution to be found in linguistics or in mere meter; for in no part of the generally recognized lyrico-ritual poetry even have students of vocabulary or experts in meter succeeded in winning any certain

or convincing results. But throughout all the kinds of Hebrew poetry the dramatic quality is universal and dominant. A given poem may have been sung, but even in the many ways of singing, the dramatic characteristics may predominate over the lyrical. Another poem may have been part of the temple service, but its dramatic qualities are more significant than its ritual use. Still another poem may have found its source in some striking prophetic message, but it is the same dramatic quality that is its deepest characteristic. And in Proverbs, however little the main body and the introduction may resemble each other, they are identical in their individualistic, picturesque lines, each of which flashes forth a complete thought or observation or likeness or truth in short and vivid and therefore doubly memorable sentences.

Some sort of dramatic interpretation, from the point of view of *public recitation* in various settings, is the open sesame to the real power and beauty of all Hebrew poetry. Long before writing was common the Hebrews had a well developed literature whose sole method of preservation was by word of mouth. Long after writing was common practical considerations made books scarce, and word of mouth was still the usual method of transmission. Under the schooling of such discipline memory and tongue became equally skilful. Thus the Hebrew became an expert reciter, as his history and poetry alike show.

Only as we can reconstruct the oral situation, regain the picturesque point of view, and enter into the emotional and dramatic nature of the gifted Hebrew, profoundest of Orientals, can we fully master his wonderful poetry, climax of his religious literature.

(TO BE CONCLUDED)

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

By E. G. SIHLER, Ph. D., of New York University

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.—Among the most careful studies of Clement has been that of the late Dr. Charles Bigg, Bampton Lecturer at Oxford, whose lectures were published there in 1886. Bigg died in 1908. I wish the data which he uses to furnish a cultural background for the Alexandria of Septimius Severus were more numerous and more illuminating than they actually are. That the translators of the Septuagint had Platonic leanings may be questioned, I dare say. I would not characterize Plutarch as “a cultivated gnostic” (The Christian Platonists of Alexandria, 1886, p. 29). I cannot agree with Bigg in conceiving Clement as “turgid and verbose” (p. 47), or as a rhetorician, for thought, proof, metaphysics, doctrine, predominated in his intellectual personality. But, setting aside many minor points of dissent, I am least able to subscribe to the following estimate of the British scholar: “In his desire to win back the sectaries [*i. e.*, the Gnostics] he draped Christianity in a Gnostic garb” (p. 84), or when he makes Clement a kind of sire of Neoplatonism (p. 64). Plotinus, I am quite sure, would have rejected the imputation of such dependency with that gentle irony of which he was a master. On the other hand, we must heed the following utterance of the Bampton lecturer, viz., that Gnosticism in the second century constituted a greater danger to the Christian church than did Arianism later on.

THE general aim of these studies, as I have intimated before, is to examine with particular care the contact and conflict of Christianity with the pagan world, a contact and conflict by no means of courts and lictors only. While the sources and documents especially available for our purpose are not as numerous as we might wish, they are, for the concluding part of the second century after Christ, bound up with two names particularly. These are Clement of Alexandria

and Tertullian of Carthage; each of them a pronounced character, but differing widely. They exhibit, each in his turn, much of what was then typical and urgent in the Greek church and in the Latin.

Both are occupied, in the main, with three concerns and bodies of interest: First, the pagan world; second, the Christian church, then beginning to assume the epithet of Catholic (the general or universal), though without a trace of headship for the see of Rome, the term being determined, then, entirely by the universal acceptance of the essential points of Christian faith. The appropriation of this particular adjective, *Catholic*, was most probably due to that which we may call the third concern of the patristic authors named before, viz., the many and dangerous heresies gravely and constantly threatening the church without and within, manifold movements and systems and cults, forms of cosmological and theosophical speculation in the main, and claiming a superiority of higher knowledge by the haughty and self-assertive terms of Gnostics and Gnosticism.

It was, I believe, to clarify and determine its own ground and foundation, as over against this dangerous theosophy claiming to be the highest form of Christianity, that the Christian church was driven to define its most precious possessions. Many points, it would seem, of what we have received as the Apostles' Creed, both of the first and second articles, as well as of their connection and interdependence, may have been formulated in, or in consequence of, that struggle and that necessary self-definition. Both Clement and Tertullian flourished in the reign of Septimius Severus, from 193 A.D. on, and their most important works seem to have been then written. The

body of writings left by them is so large that each will require a separate treatment.

My aim in this study must be coupled with a certain self-denial. While striving to present to the readers of *THE BIBLICAL REVIEW* what is characteristic and significant, I shall abstain from generalizations, which, while they dazzle the uninformed, are too often unaccompanied by sound and searching mastery of detail. As far as possible, Clement is to speak for himself. The Greek text of the Oxford edition of his writings (1869) covers some 1,200 pages more or less. Clement taught, and preached, too, in one of the greatest—we may confidently say, in *the* greatest—center of Greek culture then existing within the Roman Empire. The enormous range of his classic citations has tempted some scholars to suggest that he resorted to anthologies, and, in the domain of philosophy and general erudition, to certain current collections called doxographies.¹ It is quite undeniable that Clement often reminds us, in his surveys of the data of learning or letters, of Diogenes Laertius and Athenaeus.

But let us now come a little closer to him. His trend was that of the student and of the searcher after soul-satisfaction. In the introduction to the first book of his *Stromateis*, he calls these notes (ὑπομνήματα) something “treasured up against his old age, a remedy of forgetfulness, an image simply and an outline of those discourses and of those men endowed with clearness and soul-power whom I have been deemed worthy to listen to, blessed men and really noteworthy. Of these the one was in Greece, the Ionian, another in

¹See the Prolegomena of Herm. Diels to his *Doxographi Graeci*, Berlin, 1879.

Magna Graecia, another of them was of Coelesyria, another from Egypt, and others in different parts of the East; and of this section, the one was of the Assyrians, the other in Palestine, a Hebrew by origin. But when I had fallen in with the last one [the Christian ex-Stoic of Alexandria] (in power he proved to be the first), I came to rest in Egypt, having hunted after things concealed from my vision." (Stromateis, I, 11.)

Pantaenus then was the mediating influence which connected Clement's Greek philosophy with the apostles. "But"—the reader will please carefully note the expression chosen by Clement—"the men who are preserving the true tradition of the blessed teaching *directly from* [εὐθὺς] Peter and James, John and Paul, the holy Apostles, son receiving it from father—few are equal to their fathers—they came indeed, with God's help, to me too, destined to deposit that ancestral and apostolic seed."

The *Protrepticus* (Hortatory Discourse) of Clement need not detain us very long. It was addressed "to the Greeks." It presents as absurd and contemptible the idolatry of popular tradition and practice, speaks of the pantomimic ritual practiced there (τὰ ὄργια) of the gods morally despicable; exactly as from Lucian we learned how the Olympian legends furnished current entertainment on the stage. "The sorcerers now boast that the demons [the pagan gods] are servants of their own wickedness, having enrolled them as slaves to themselves, namely, these whom they have made bondsmen to themselves by constraint, by means of their incantations; further then there are weddings and cohabitations and childbirths of gods recorded, and adulteries sung and feastings travestied

and guffaws of laughter introduced at drink, which urge me to cry out aloud, even though I desire to hold my peace. Out upon the godlessness! *You have made a stage of heaven* and the deity has become a stageplay to you, and holiness you have travestied with a mask of supernatural beings, having made a parody of true piety by superstition" (*Protrepticus*, 58). The moral indignation with which he speaks of Antinous, the deified concubine of the Emperor Hadrian, renders him positively eloquent: "And another god in Egypt, almost also among the Greeks, the Emperor of Rome by way of worship [σεβασμῶς] has set up as god, his supremely fair boy-concubine Antinous, whom he consecrated in the way Zeus did Ganymede, for concupiscence is not easily checked when it has no fear; and during holy nights men now worship Antinous, nights which his [imperial] lover who spent them jointly in waking, knew were base. Why recountest to me as god him, who has been honored through prostitution? * * * Do not act the despot, O thou mere man, over comeliness, and do not deal wantonly with the youth in his bloom; keep it pure, that it may be comely. Become a king of comeliness, not a despot; remain free; then I shall spread abroad your comeliness, because you have kept the image pure; then I shall worship true beauty, which is the archetype of the fair ones" (49).

Here then we have, in the *Presbyter of Alexandria*, a distinct echo and reminiscence of Plato's *Phaedrus*. And so, too, the men of the pagan world adorn their chambers with paintings of their pagan gods in attitudes of unnatural lust², or of Ares and Aphrodite

²*Loc. cit.*, 60.

enmeshed together, or of Zeus and Leda on sealrings. Quite aptly, as Paul did (Rom. 1:25: "And worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator"), Clement likewise conceives paganism summarily thus: "I seek God, not the works of God" (*Protrepticus*, 67) or: "But thou conceivest not God, but it is the heavens that you worship" (81). For Clement's homiletic vein, see particularly 83, 84, 105, 107, 113, 115, 117, 120.

But even in this shorter and we may say more popular work Greek philosophy enters in again and again, for in the devoted and enthusiastic pre-Christian period of his life many elements and aspirations of it found a permanent lodgment in his soul, elements which he earnestly strove to endow with spiritual content or spiritual significance, terms and conceptions which he endeavored outright to dovetail into the structure of his Christian theology—Platonic matter chiefly. Now Plato's monotheism, to my vision and judgment, is a very vague and vapory something, with all the dithyrambic passages in *Republic*, *Phaedrus*, *Phaedo*, etc.; his god is a being attainable but rarely to the rapturous or ecstatic vision which is vouchsafed to a very small elite of philosophers—no genuine worship can be directed at, no sustaining spiritual support can be derived from, so metaphysical a being. That deeper experience of the essential impotence and insolvency of the soul, which turns to God in Christ as the hart panteth after the water-brooks—this, I say, is an experience, which, as an experience, unless I am mistaken, is unrecorded in Clement's extant works.

At bottom he is academic and bookish; truth is dear to him as gained as the apex or consummation

in a long or elaborate process of study and reflection—and there is no good reason to consider as non-authentic book VIII of the *Stromateis*. He actually apostrophizes Plato and incidentally cites from the latter's *Timaeus*:³ “How then must we trace God [ἐξιχνευτέον τὸν θεόν] to Plato? For to find the father and maker of this universe is a severe task, and, having found, to make utterance to all is impossible” (*Protrepticus*, 68). We must add here at once that Clement (like Philo Judaeus of Alexandria, who flourished 40 A.D.) was sincerely convinced that Plato owed the best of his theology and cosmogony to Moses, as he owed his geometry to Egypt, his astronomy to Babylon; all of which Philonian and Old Testament doctrine, and even New Testament, Clement, in all his works, over and over again, dubs “the barbarian philosophy,” we would say the non-Greek. So, too, he cites with warm approbation from Kleanthes, the second head of the Stoic sect, the famous Hymn on the Good which Clement actually calls “a true theology.” And so, too, in a fervid passage on salvation and regeneration: “Let us⁴ strive to do good by way of union with the monadic essence,” a harsh metaphysical term in a Christian setting. These things are like little stones in the bread we are chewing. He also (like Tertullian) calls attention to the marvelous spread of Christianity in a comparatively short time; he urges the universality of the precepts of Christian ethics.⁴

Of the *Paedagogus* I have even less to say. It is a body of monitions, mainly practical and concrete monitions, to assimilate our actual life and conduct

³28, c.

⁴*Protrepticus*, 72, 88, 110.

to Christ⁵, who was "God stainless in the form of man, a servant to his father's will, the Word [λόγος, John 1] God, he who is in the Father, who is from the right hand of the Father, * * * who in the flesh, displayed the same eminence both of practical and theoretical life." We see Aristotle's terminology asserting itself in close juxtaposition to St. John's Gospel. In this ethical treatise Stoic parallels and terms also intrude.

In a way this work has special elements of interest for the antiquarian, for it definitely descends to the concrete things of life and the customs of life, such as the table and gluttony, with an interesting allusion to the Love-feast of the Christian church as well as to the diet of Pythagoras, a discourse on luxury and the simple life; or, he says that Plato, as a devotee of the latter "fanned into flame the fire of Hebraic philosophy." On drinking he discourses, beginning with 1 Timothy 5:23, with many incidental observations and suggestions. His faculty of association and of reminiscence indeed is unfathomable, and, we must add, somewhat incalculable and irrepressible. Famous vintages are enumerated, also many national and tribal customs. Further on he takes up domestic furniture and equipment, feasts and hospitality, jests and witticisms, foul speech, wisdom in social intercourse, wreaths and unguents, with many illustrations drawn from the classical writers of Greece. Again he discusses sleep, and the aims of wedlock, with curious parallels from Leviticus, to which Plato, he claims, was beholden; he also calls Plato "a disciple, in his Philebus, of the non-Greek philosophy"; on other forms of luxury, as in dress and textile fabrics, on the

⁵*Paedagogus*, I, 4, 102.

purple dye, on footwear, on gold and precious stones, with special reference to women.*

These topics are continued in book III. He discusses there personal embellishment, with citations from the later Attic comedy, citations reminding one of Athenaeus descanting on certain forms of effeminacy and luxury which destroyed Greece; on dandies and the artificial and unnatural smoothness of face cultivated by these. His reference to nature and the natural hirsuteness of males, as in the case of the lion, is quite in the Stoic vein. Next he takes up human association and social intercourse, baths; says that the Christian alone is rich, that the simple life is a good *viaticum* in the Christian's pilgrimage. There follow gymnasia and physical training; then he presents summaries and surveys of Christian life, generally with ample Scriptural quotation and in the spirit of the New Testament. We may lay aside this concise syllabus with the remark that Clement's practical Christianity is more distinctly and genuinely Christian than his theoretical Christianity and what we may call his systematic theology.†

But the greater and the more important part of this study must needs deal with the greatest and most important of his extant works, the eight books of notes and musings called by him *Stromateis* (not *Stromata*). It is an odd term. As to the word itself, the Atticist lexicographer Pollux,‡ of Naucratis in Egypt (by the bye, a close contemporary of our own Clement) says: "What the older [Greeks] called στρωματόδεσμα [*stromato-desma*, coverlet-binders, rug-

**Paedagogus*, II, pp. 1, 6, 11, 16, 18, 30, 32, 35, 40, 45, 49, 53, 61, 88, 91, 100, 104, 114, 116, 118.

†*Op. cit.*, III, 4, 13, 24, 26, 34, 37, 49.

‡*Onomasticon*, VII, 79.

holders] these the later [Greeks] called στρωματεῖς, in which, as the term indicates, they stored their coverlets [τὰ στρώματα ἀπετίθεντο], but of course also their other articles of dress"—something, then, like the modern clothes-presses, cedar chests, and the like. Clearly, then, these collections or receptacles of the Alexandrian presbyter were meant to contain a great many things, a very great variety of things often somewhat unrelated to one another, every kind, every item in the total, of Clement's spiritual, cultural, philosophical garments or other equipment were there to be stored away, and found there when wanted, if for no other one, then for himself in his old age. They were, in a way, pandects of his Christian philosophy. The Presbyter himself⁹ urges the varied and composite character of these collections as he is aware of his deeply ingrained habit of free and untrammelled passing from topic to topic (διστρωμένα ἀπ' ἄλλου εἰς ἄλλο μετίοντα), turning a kaleidoscope as we might say.

Of St. Paul there are rather more than five hundred citations in the extant works of Clement (of James but seven, of Peter twenty-four). Dr. Bigg indeed¹⁰ speaks of the "inferiority of St. Paul" in Clement. And indeed it must be candidly admitted that, as to the great Apostle's conception of Christ crucified as supreme foolishness to the Greeks (as we see that it proved to be when we read the scornful slurs of a Celsus, for instance), we cannot fairly fail to see that his conception does not appeal to Clement. As I understand him, his great aim and incessant striving—we may plainly call it a futile or fatuous aim—was, to make of the *Logos* a finality, an apex,

⁹*Stromateis*, IV, 4.

¹⁰Platonists of Alexandria, p. 53.

a didactic and philosophical complement and completion of the best spiritual or quasi-spiritual strivings and utterances to be found in the Greek writers, whether of belles lettres or philosophy, from Homer and Hesiod onward. Besides, many of these authors—we must not forget it—were themselves the stock and substance of the current schools and schooling, with *grammaticus* and *rhetor*, and it was immaterial whether the pupils were Christian, Jew or Gentile; there was, in fact, no other education, there was no other culture.

When we survey the data furnished by the indices of the Oxford edition which I have used (1869), we find that, of the poets, Homer comes first, Hesiod is often cited, Pindar has a conspicuous rank, the moral intensity and dialectic restlessness of Euripides made him much more available for Clement than Sophocles and Aeschylus. The Pseudosybilline quotations, with their but slightly veiled condemnation of paganism, make us pause; Clement was no great critic, not even a fairly careful critic.

Of the philosophers, Plato is foremost; no other one of this class approaches him in the frequency of allusion, quotation or parallel. Heraclitus (the real sire of Stoic cosmology, though he lived long before Zeno) is also much used, then Aristotle. The Stoics collectively are cited some dozen times, Zeno and Cleanthes not very often, and Chrysippus, the prolific and authoritative third head of that school, not at all. Of the representatives of cosmic speculation besides Heraclitus, there are notable Empedocles, Democritus, Epicurus; we marvel at the slight use he made of the most spiritual of them all, Anaxagoras. One is almost tempted to assume that Clement was himself a gram-

maticus before he became a presbyter, at least he had the love and, to some extent, the habits and consciousness of a grammaticus.

This brings us at once to that literary and didactic trait in Clement which perhaps is more striking and odd to the Christian student than any other; I mean the direct way in which he places the Greek classics in juxtaposition with the Old and New Testaments. Thus he passes from Proverbs to Pindar,¹¹ from Proverbs to Heraclitus of Ephesus, and again from the Ephesian thinker to Habakkuk 2:4: "The just shall live by his faith." From our Lord's saying: "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (John 20:29), he goes on—to what do you think? To the irresistible charm of the mythical sirens. In his analysis of faith (πίστις), he takes up Thales and Anaxagoras and their fundamental tenets. He has indeed an itch for what we may call in a very loose way psychological parallels, an itch which he never curbs or represses, and the point of contact is quite often very faint or elusive. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that Erasmus did much better work in his *Adagia*. The sonship of Christ, his surpassing nobility of source and descent—this reminds Clement of a passage in Plato's *Phaedrus* (279 B): "O dear Pan and all ye other gods who dwell here, grant to me to become comely within," etc. We indeed shake our heads. From Christ he passes to Epicharmus. Homer (*sic*) foretold or foreshadowed the believer; from Stoic ethics he passes to Paul's whole armor of God.¹² We must not permit ourselves to yield to strong emotion nor to concupiscence (the

¹¹*Stromateis*, I, 181.

¹²*Op. cit.*, II, 8, 9, 14, 22, 24, 102, 109.

male and female elements of the soul), but keep them subject to the rational faculty—good Platonic doctrine this, reminding Clement of St. Paul (Gal. 3:28), “there is neither male nor female”—but patience! The excellent Paul “holds it more Platonic [*sic*] that the soul, being divine from above, having been rendered feminine through desire, should come hither [*i. e.*, on earth] into generation and into passing away” (III, 93)—the pre-existence and incarnation of souls foisted upon St. Paul.

We call Clement a Greek Father, but in many of his utterances he is more of a Greek than a Father. Pythagoras, seeming to call God alone wise, reminds him of St. Paul (Rom. 16:27: “To God only wise, be glory,” etc.). From a passage in Plato’s *Phaedo* dealing with bliss, he goes on to the Beatitudes of our Lord. From Paul (1 Cor. 4:9, 11-13) he passes to Plato’s Republic. He cites types of heroism from the Old Testament and from Greece. In speaking of the elect, he cites Greek poets for epithets. In short, the loftier and finer things in his culture were so deeply intertwined with his spiritual aspirations and convictions that, in him, Hellenism and Christianity appear in a union, incongruous and artificial withal, but no less real in his particular and subjective personality.”

Let us now look at what he says of the church, also at his general theology and Christology. He plainly says¹³ that the actual Christians in their preponderant majority never had any philosophical training or even general culture, some of them were even unlettered men. He is, somehow, obsessed by the char-

¹³*Op. cit.*, IV, 9, 37, 52, 118-124, 171.

¹⁴*Op. cit.*, I, 99.

acteristic and ineradicable desire to conceive Christian revelation as a kind of "philosophy." He intimates that there are among actual Christians those who are fond of finding fault (φιλεγκλήμονες) with philosophy in this connection. On the other hand, he says: "We call brothers those who have been regenerated by the same word" (II, 41). We observe also that a regular cycle of lessons from Scripture to be read in churches was fully established (περικοπαί). So, citing a few words from Isaiah 1:11, he adds: "And the entire lesson" (καὶ πᾶσα ἡ περικοπή). In the *Stromateis* III, 80, he cites from 1 Corinthians 7:39, 40: "The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; * * * after my judgment"; then he quotes Romans 7:4: "Ye also are become dead to the law" "in the preceding lesson" (ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας περικοπῆς). Obviously, then, the contents and sequence of readings in a definite cycle of the church-year were well established and familiar to all Christians.¹⁵ He refers to 1 Corinthians 6:1ff. as "a very great pericope" (*Stromateis*, VII, 84); elsewhere: "In each pericope" (VI, 131). He calls the church the personal bride of Christ. The Gnostics often used "the Gospel according to the Egyptians," but he sets this aside as not within the true canon of the four genuine and authentic Gospels.¹⁶

We may here set down the sum total of citations, as given in the index of volume 3 of the Oxford edition of Clement. For Matthew I counted 329, for Mark 40, for Luke 143, for John 130, which four he also designates as "*the four Gospels handed down to us*" (III, 93). Alluding to the front seats

¹⁵Cf. A. C. Hall, s. v. *Pericope*, in the New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.

¹⁶*Stromateis*, III, 49, 66.

reserved for the dignitaries of the church, he says that, in a spiritual sense, one may be a presbyter and a deacon without having been formally chosen or elected (χειροτονούμενος, VI, 106). "The spiritual body, that is to say, the holy church" (VII, 87).

Turn we now to the expansion of the Christian church and so also to persecution and martyrdom. In leading up to the universality of the Christian church he cites first the parallel of the schools of Greek philosophy and the founders and leaders thereof, such as Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and others, "who persuaded their own sectaries [αἰρετιστάς] only, * * * but the word of our teacher did not remain in Judaea alone, as philosophy did in Greece, but was poured out [ἐχύθη] throughout all the inhabited world, persuading Greeks at the same time and barbarians, by tribes [at a time], by villages, by entire cities, transforming entire households, and specifically each of those who gave ear, and of the philosophers themselves, actually to the truth." "As for our own teaching, even with the first announcement thereafter, kings [the usual term for the Roman emperors] and autocrats have been checking it, and those who hold office and leadership in parts, with all their mercenaries, in addition also those of the ignorant men who make a dead set against us and try to annihilate it with all their might, *but it* [the Christian teaching] *flourishes even more*; for it does not die like human teaching or waste away like a feeble gift, for no gift of God is feeble but endures unchecked as one of which it has been prophesied that it would be persecuted to the end" (IV, 167).

On martyrs and martyrdom Clement specifically discourses (IV, 13ff.): "We call martyrdom consum-

mation" (τελείωσιν). Elsewhere he calls it "the witnessing for the Lord through blood" (VI, 44), and that such a portal of death is the beginning of real life, citing also Plato's *Phaedo* (107, c): "If death were the end of all," etc., evidently as a very familiar passage. "Full then is all the church of those who have prepared themselves for the death that is to enliven them into Christ, prepared their life long," both men and women.¹⁷ He gathers together the pertinent warning of our Lord from Luke 12:8, from Mark 8:38, from Matthew 10:32, and again from Luke 12:11ff. But no one should spontaneously offer himself to the courts:¹⁸ "They persecute us then, not having found us out to be unrighteous, but presuming from the mere fact that we are Christians, that we do wrong in our life" (IV, 79).

In his conception of God, the influence of Philo and of Plato is abundantly suggested. "The non-composite Being, which is neither associated with matter, nor is matter, nor from matter" (II, 45). "Worshiping the God of all through the high-priest, the Word" (II, 45). "The highest contemplation is that endowed with vision" (Philo, Plato, II, 47). The first conversion and repentance is the only genuine one," a curious doctrine. Obedience or disobedience to the divine law is in our power (ἐφ' ἡμῶν, the Stoic term), because, as he argues, "only voluntary acts are subject to judgment" (II, 59 *fin.*). Here he cites Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, 3, 2. Salvation is the will of God, *i. e.*, for those who repent." God is not responsible for our choice of living or for

¹⁷*Cf.* also *Stromateis*, IV, 68.

¹⁸*Op. cit.*, IV, 77.

¹⁹*Op. cit.*, II, 56.

²⁰*Op. cit.*, II, 60, 73.

evil (καὶ ἔστιν ὁ θεός ἀναίτιος; cf. Plato, Republic, II, 379.)

The four canonic virtues of the Greeks, *i. e.*, Fortitude, Wisdom, Self-control, Justice, are recognized. The Deity is without wants and without emotions (ἀπαθείς), where Stoicism asserted itself.²¹ "God is beyond our definition and is not an object of our knowledge, but the Son is both Wisdom and Knowledge and Truth and whatever else is kindred to this" (IV, 156). "God is without any beginning and is the beginning of all, the complete creative force of beginning" (IV, 162). Elsewhere, as a student of Philo, he discourses on the sacred Tetragrammaton (*Jahve*) "which is interpreted: 'He that is and He that will be.'" Elsewhere of God: "He who in unborn identity is Himself alone" (IV, 137). "The philosophy of divine revelation establishes and corroborates Providence; if this be done away with, the plan concerning the Saviour appears a mere myth" (I, 52). "The soul of a righteous man is an image of God, * * * in which the leader of all mortal and immortal beings their king and creator is enshrined and set up for worship" (VII, 16).

In his Christology, where Plato and the Stoics did not as a rule intrude, we have fairly the conception of St. John's Gospel, and of St. Paul. "The Saviour always saves and always works [John 5:17], as he sees the Father" (I, 12). "Those who were before the incarnation of the Word" (I, 81). He cordially appropriates Paul's familiar declaration of the Crucified, the "power of God, and the wisdom of God," in meeting the dissent of certain ones "wise in their own conceit" (δοκησισόφωι); he never honors the

²¹*Op. cit.*, II, 81.

Gnostics with the name Gnostics, of which more further on (IV, 107). Of Christ: "On this account the Word has been called Alpha and Omega" (Rev. 1:8, 9; *Stromateis*, IV, 157). Christ, the Word, *is not the Logos of emanation* (οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ προφορικὸς, *Stromateis*, V, 6). "The Word is the discloser of the peculiar essence of the Father" (V, 34). "The Principle and First-fruits of existing things, itself without time and without beginning, the Son" (VII, 2). I close this topic with a passage of a peculiar loftiness and fervor: "Most perfect indeed and most holy and most sovereign and most commanding and most royal and most beneficent is the nature of the Son, which is most closely attached to the only Omnipotent One. This is the greatest Excellence, which ordains all things in accordance with the will of the Father and pilots the universe in the best manner, working all things with untiring and irreducible power" (VII, 5).

As to the exegesis of Clement, he, like Philo before him, is utterly steeped in that vicious and fanciful practice of allegorizing, and of sniffing mysterious or hidden meanings accessible only to the esoteric expert, a principle infinitely elastic and infinitely elusive. What I cite of this is to serve chiefly as a deterrent example. The word enigma is derived from the verb αἰνίττομαι (*ainittomai*), to express, or to suggest, intend or convey, a concealed or cryptic meaning, and this same verb Clement uses over and over again in his exegetical digressions. When our Lord says (Matt. 8:20): "The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man hath not *where to lay his head*"—this means, says our speculative presbyter, that "the Head

of Existence, the good and gentle Word, rests only in the believer, who is utterly separated from the others who are called beasts by Scripture." The Pillar of Fire signifies that God cannot be represented in an image (τὸ ἀνεικόνιστον τοῦ θεοῦ, I, 163). The rich man who is compared with the camel (Matt. 19:24) that cannot pass through the eye of a needle—what is the meaning? That the rich man is unable to pursue wisdom." By "birds of the air" (Matt. 8:20) are meant those "who have the faculty [*sic*] of winging themselves to the understanding of the heavenly Word" (IV, 31).

Fanciful to a degree is his exposition of the familiar Beatitude (Matt. 5:4): "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall *be comforted*" (παρακληθήσονται), for Philo's disciple in allegorical and other subjective lore injects a new meaning into that compound: "*They shall attend at the summons*" (εἰς τὴν κλήσιν παρέσονται), in some Platonic sense, at a new incarnation of souls and the incidental allotment of lives." In Matthew 5:25, "agree with thine adversary quickly"—what is the adversary (ἀντίδικος)? "Not the body as some [probably Gnostics] claim, but Satan and those who resemble him, who is 'in the way with us' by means of men who imitate his deeds in this earthly life." What barnacles of exegetical conceit have not, in the history of the Christian church, attached themselves to the Word of God, the ship of life and vessel of eternity!

But all that we have hitherto said of the *Stromateis*, of the Alexandrine presbyter and teacher of the neophytes, is brought in by him *en passant* merely.

²*Op. cit.*, II, 22.

³*Op. cit.*, IV, 37.

It is time now that we take up the chief purport of his notes and rambling discussion. What is it? It is to set forth his own *gnosis* and his own standard and ideals as a Christian thinker. My readers will please observe, that in his skirmishing with the Gnostics, a running polemic carried through the first seven books, the terms γνῶσις (*gnosis*) and γνωστικός (*gnostikos*) are consistently withheld from the Gnostics and as consistently, nay, rigorously, reserved for himself and for his own standard of Christian (Platonizing) thought and speculation. He surveys in a manner his own life and learning, he defines himself, so to speak, against every force, attitude or thesis which was not congenial to him. The peculiar syncretism of culture, philosophy, morality, and Christian belief is here most fully revealed, uttered, emphasized, iterated. To arrange this matter in a series or system of paragraphs, I shall not undertake, but content myself by presenting to my readers certain features which are characteristic and insistent.

From the Jewish thinkers, Aristobulos and Philo, Clement, as noted above, had appropriated the following thesis: That Plato and even Pythagoras had taken over many of their doctrines from Moses.²⁴ And so Clement calls Plato "the philosopher from the Hebrews" (I, 10). True philosophers (and here Clement is uttering his own standards and ideals) are they who are striving for the contemplation of the Good itself through knowledge; God is "that which is" or "He who is" (τὸ ὄν, ὁ ὢν, Philonism and Platonism, *Stromateis*, I, 166). The Unity of God is referred to as taught in two specific passages in Plato.²⁵ Unbelievers remind him of a passage in

²⁴Cf. *Stromateis*, I, 150.

²⁵*Op. cit.*, I, 182.

Plato. Plato is cited in a discourse on Faith.²⁰ The highest felicity according to Plato is "assimilation to God" (ὁμοίωσις θεῷ, II, 100; cf. Plato, *Theaetetus*, 176): "The flight [from the material world] is assimilation to God as far as possible, and assimilation is, to become righteous and pious, coupled with understanding." Even the Trinity is deduced from Plato.²¹ *Time* came only with creation.²² It is a large subject, but we have no space to pursue it further.

Again, Clement often appears a Stoic, that is to say, the terminology of Stoical ethics is fairly his own, a tool with which he operates. Thus of purpose or design (προαίρεσις, ὁρμή, I, 84); intellectual assent (συγκατάθεσις, *passim*); choice and avoidance in action (αἵρεσις καὶ φυγή, II, 12); anticipation and comprehension in cognition (πρόληψις and κατάληψις, II, 17); the manifold excellencies of the (ideal) sage; the ten elements which constitute man: Body, soul, the five senses, the voice, the power of propagation, reason; charity for others (τὸ κοινωνικόν, II, 73). He who has one virtue has them all on account of their interdependence. He refuses, however, to follow the Stoics in their pantheistic identification of God and Nature.²³ Further "to yield to the passions is uttermost slavery" (II, 101). He admires the doctrine of the Stoics which asserts the autonomy of the soul as over against the body; over and over he cites the "sovereign power" (viz., reason, τὸ ἡγεμονικόν). Preferred and not preferred things.²⁴ Intelligence extended through the universe.²⁵ These data could be greatly extended.

²⁰*Op. cit.*, II, 15, 18.

²¹*Stromateis*, V, 108.

²²Cf. Plato, *Timaeus*, 37, and, from this source, Philo *passim*.

²³*Stromateis*, II, 19, 50, 80, 101.

²⁴*Op. cit.*, IV, 19, 164.

²⁵*Op. cit.*, V, 155.

So equipped, then, and taking with him such material elements out of the nobler schools into Christianity when he accepted it, he really endeavors (as I have already intimated) to make of Christianity a kind of academic process, a philosophy *par excellence*, for which the best elements of human culture, especially in philosophy and its ancillary disciplines, might serve as a propaedeutic. What he personally had gone through was to be typical.

That the spirit and essence of our Lord's redemption, as well as His self-revelation and teaching on earth, differ *toto caelo* from this academic syncretism of the Alexandrine presbyter-philosopher I need hardly even use words to observe. What then did he prize and assert as precious and dominant in this academic striving and ideals? He rejects the theory that philosophy owes its origin to the Evil One. Evidently there were then Christians of narrower vision, who claimed, perhaps from concrete instances of certain representations of philosophy, that this pursuit grievously injured human life by breeding fictitious notions and evil works. These simpler Christians (whom Clement keenly disliked) demanded but faith and belief, pure and simple. The universality of his own culture and concern is for him a foundation which he will not abandon to the clamor of these narrower brethren. In such citation he views himself as "a much-experienced tracker of truth" (I, 44), a versatile touchstone indeed. According to Clement, exegesis of apostles and prophets calls for men professionally equipped for lucidity of instruction (ἐντέχνους); dialectic therefore is for such men a requisite. The operation of reason is accomplished conformably to God; he abruptly cites John 1:3 (the

Word): "and without him was not anything made that was made." It is quite plain here, that his Stoic inheritance and prepossession get the better of sober and objective reading of St. John's Gospel. In Clement we may as well be prepared for that sort of thing at any point, at any time. The believer, indeed, must not be intellectually indolent.²²

On the other hand, he dwells on Colossians 2:4, 8: "This I say, lest any man should beguile you with enticing words. * * * Beware lest there shall be any one that maketh spoil of you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." The power of God, not the wisdom of men, is Paul's dominant concern. But the Alexandrine scholar insists that St. Paul's warning refers only to anti-spiritual systems like that of Epicurus, which denied Providence, and to other materialistic theories of the universe.²³

He is fond of the vicious thesis that "one must conceal the wisdom spoken in mystery which the Son of God taught" (I, 55), the same, however, of whom we read: "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes" (Matt. 11:25). Clement holds that the choice of the good and the turning away from the evil is "*in our own power*," a matter of self-determination (αὐτεξούσιον)—hardly in consonance, I fear, with the moral experience of our human kind—"in order that it may show the true philosophy transmitted through the Son" (I, 89). General culture is a coefficient or contributory

²²*Op. cit.*, I, 18, 20, 43, 51.

²³*Op. cit.*, I, 52.

factor to rouse or train the soul toward the intelligible things (πρὸς τὰ νοητά, I, 93 *fin.*), a reminiscence, or better, a cherished element preserved of his Platonic pursuits." This propaedeutic is for him an equipment to maintain himself against the heresies³⁶—he means the Gnostics. Like Philo (whom he follows more frequently than he names him), Clement conceives Moses as one who in his making and training absorbed and appropriated all then extant culture and "philosophy"; from Moses this tradition passed to Jews, from Jews to Phoenicians, from Phoenicians to Greeks.³⁷

In discussing faith (πίστις), his manner of procedure is essentially analytical-psychological, and barely touches upon what is the specifically Christian essence of this great subject. He even quotes as experts on "Faith" such thinkers as Theophrastus and Aristotle, nay, Epicurus even.³⁸ Although his Christian conception will assert itself against these futile parallels, he admits at the end of these reflections that faith is more elemental (στοιχειωδέστερα) or essential than any other one of the virtues which lead to higher insight or γνῶσις,³⁹ as is the breathing of air for the maintaining of physical life. And still he cites, too, St. Paul (1 Cor. 8:1): "Knowledge puffeth up" (II, 48). Again and again he utters as the summit to which his superior insight is to lead him: "The greatest contemplation, that endowed with the faculty of a [transcendental] intuition [ἡ ἐποπτική], the real knowledge which proves to be unchangeable

³⁶*Cf.* Plato, Republic, VII, 529-531.

³⁷*Stromateis*, I, 99.

³⁸*Op. cit.*, I, 153.

³⁹*Op. cit.*, II, 9-15.

⁴⁰*Op. cit.*, II, 31.

[ἀμετάπτωτος, a term used by both Plato and Aristotle] through reason" (II, 47). In that attainment, distinctly possible for a very small elite only, the man of deeper insight is he "who by way of image and assimilation imitates God as far as it is possible"—a Platonism in the main, as we have suggested before." The peace with God, certainly, which passeth all understanding, is not, and cannot in any wise be conceived as, the summit or apex of any academic or cogitative process whatsoever.

Platonic, too, it is, when in his discussion of absolute celibacy demanded by the Encratites, precursors these of monastic vows—when in that discussion Clement designates the body as "the tomb of the soul" (III, 77). His Platonism in fact crowds and grips his Christianity again and again in a manner which appears to us forced and fanciful, and is indeed painful to us who never had to disabuse our soul from that cocoon of Platonism, which to Clement is much more than a general propaedeutic of his logical and spiritual faculties. "Reasonably then Plato too says that the god who has the faculty of contemplating the ideas will live among men" (IV, 155). "For when the soul, having risen beyond incarnation, is by itself and associates with the Ideas, such as is the eminent one in the *Theaetetus*," becoming like an angel, now will be with Christ, being endowed with the faculty forever of contemplation in gazing upon the will of God"—really: "A wise man he alone, but they like shadows flit" (Homer, *Odyssey*, 10, 495). "For the dead bury their own dead" (IV, 155). Let my readers patiently ponder over this naïve grafting of

²⁸*Op. cit.*, II, 97; cf. Plato, *Republic*, X, 613, B.

²⁹P. 173, c.

Christianity on Platonism (or of grafting Platonism on Christianity). I may aid the effect by withholding all comment.

Death, too, is conceived in the Platonic manner. Clement begins indeed with St. Paul (2 Cor. 5:9): "Wherefore we labor that, whether present or absent [*i. e.*, in the body] we may be accepted of him." But, after quoting from Epicharmus and from Pindar, Clement goes on: "The soul which chose the best life from God and righteousness, exchanges heaven for earth" (IV, 167). "The idea is the conceit of God" (V, 16). Like Philo, Clement interprets a certain passage in Plato's Republic,^a a passage from the vision of Er, describing the punishment inflicted on a tyrant after death in the realm of souls, by presenting the ministers of retributive justice as angels, and citing Psalm 104, 4: "Who maketh his angels spirits, his ministers a flaming fire."

What we may call his characteristic syncretism, often verging close on deism, is set forth in the following: "For clearly, I think, he revealed the one and only God, comprehended by the Greeks in a gentile manner [*ἐθνικῶς*], by the Jews in Jewish manner, and in a novel and spiritual manner by us" (VI, 41). "The ordinary Christians [*οἱ πολλοί*], as children fear the spooks so they fear the Greek philosophy, being afraid lest it may lead them astray" (VI, 80). With Clement personally, indeed, *gnosis* is something more exalted than *pistis*, and we are well aware that mere *belief* does not rank with *faith*. Citing from the Shepherd of Hermas, the Alexandrine presbyter goes on to say that "Scripture is clear to all as taken by the bare reading, and that this is the *belief* which

^aX, p. 615.

holds the sequence of the sounds, on which account also the literal reading is subjected to allegorical interpretation, but that the unfolding of the Scriptures by way of deeper understanding we receive as something comparable to reading by syllables" (VI, 131). "He who is pure in heart, not on account of the commandments, but on account of his higher insight, he is a friend of God" (VII, 19). We must, however, close this part of our study, and we shall do so by choosing one of the most significant of his utterances of self-revelation: "But the statements of Belief, being commonplace [or superficial, ἐπι πόλαιοι], cannot furnish a scientific endurance of the Truth. But Greek philosophy, as it were, purges and habituates the soul in advance, toward the reception of Faith, upon which the Truth builds up higher insight" (VII, 21).

But we must now turn to Clement's attitude toward, and dealing with, the Gnostics. We saw how vigorously and consistently he withholds from them their own term of γνῶσις and γνωστικός throughout. Indeed, to him the elect are they "who are endowed with the desire of enquiry leading to higher insight" (τὸ ζητητικὸν εἰς γνῶσιν). Even Job was a γνωστικός.⁴² Thus he is compelled to allude or refer to the sects and cults of the Gnostics in other modes or terms. The term αἵρεσις (*hairesis*) or αἱρέσεις is much used, sects we call it, though αἵρεσις at first was not endowed with all the condemnation or bitterness which *heresy* now connotes. The term, in fact, was taken over from the sects or schools of the Greek philosophers; primarily the word meant choice. Often, too, Clement calls the Gnostics "the accusers." These

⁴²*Stromateis*, VII, 80.

polemical or controversial references of Clement are very abundant; they come in at any time, or in connection with, or suggested by, any theme or topic whatsoever, without any prelude at all as a rule. Evidently these Gnostic critics of Christian belief, claiming a superior Christianity, were fairly ubiquitous, and their partial assumption of some elements of Christianity constituted a far greater danger to the church than the persecutions of the Empire. It was indeed a living and a burning issue, involving, as Clement's procedure shows, a facing on the part of the church, in a great many directions.

I must be content here with naming a few of the larger outstanding features then more or less common to all or almost all of the Gnostics then flourishing, particularly those derived or descended from Marcion, from Valentinus, and from Basilides. They held that this world, our world, is evil; that its creator (or *demiurge*) is responsible for that immanent evil, which after all is inherent in matter and is propagated in the generation of our species. There are two Gods. The great and primeval God alone is good, but is distinct, in every way, from the Creator. And there is little doubt but that they got their clue from certain tenets of Plato. Whenever we pass from the Republic of Plato (where the felicity and the perfection of the non-material and eternal world of forms or ideas are set forth)—whenever, I say, we pass on to Plato's effort to explain creation and the material world, an effort made in his *Timaeus*, then indeed we are brought face to face with that body of speculation out of which the Gnostics spun their dualism of the good and perfect God, and of the imperfect and inferior power, the Creator; the former being the Platonic

ideal deity, and the latter the *demiurge* of the *Timaeus* and of the Old Testament. But I am sure I shall serve these studies best by presenting Clement's strictures as directly as may be, and with a minimum of comment on my part.

With a certain consistency the Gnostics either depreciated the Old Testament, or rejected it outright, and with it the Law as a system of divine injunction or moral obligation. There were even some who made the Creator the physical sire or progenitor of mankind, or suggested a plurality of such "creators." "Some others say that man was formed by different powers, and that the parts down to the navel are of a more divine craftsmanship, but those below, of the inferior" (*Stromateis*, III, 12). Elsewhere, indeed, Clement claims that certain tenets of Plato's *Phaedo* are more lofty than those of Marcion. "The Marcionites are ungrateful to the Creator" (III, 22). Out of this dogma came the sect of the Encratites and the rejection of matrimony. For this abstinence (ἐγκράτεια) the Gnostics made responsible, "if we must call this abstinence, the Creator himself, against whom thinking to make a stand, this modern Titan is a celibate unwillingly, running down [κατατρέχων] creation and creature" (III, 25). Quite the opposite to these Encratites were the Nicolaites of the Apocalypse and the Carpocratians, who permitted the "spiritual" proficient to "abuse the flesh" and so to gratify every lust, and taught that "every kind of living is permitted to the elect" (III, 41). Consistently with their hostility toward the Old Testament, some of the Gnostics claimed that Christ was the Son, not of the Creator, but of "the good God" (III, 68). In

^a*Op. cit.*, III, 19.

Stromateis, IV, 2, Clement sets forth that Law and Gospel proclaim *one* God only, "the almighty Lord," and endeavors to show this "to all the sects."⁴⁴

Let us now turn to the affected superiority of the Gnostics, in which they looked down upon the orthodox Christians as upon men of mere belief, and as essentially inferior to themselves. The Valentinians, in Clement's day "allotted faith to us, the simple ones, but for themselves, *who by their nature are saved* in accordance with the advantage of the *distinctive seed*, they claim that there dwells in them the *gnosis* which is widely separated from faith" (II, 10). Also they claimed that faith, or belief (πίστις), was a product of fear,⁴⁵ and fear was an irrational avoidance of an emotion (πάθος, II, 32). They took much offense at St. Paul (Rom. 3:20): "For by the law is the knowledge of sin" (II, 34), for the Law, as the work of the dethroned *demiurge*, had no place or authority in their system, and any harmony or compromise with the general Christian church and its canons was herein quite impossible. Clement also charges against the Gnostics, that in their reading-out of Scripture (obviously in their services), they change accents to get a sense in conformity with their own pleasure, and so, too, they manipulated the texts of Scripture with deliberate design.⁴⁶ Earlier Gnostics (perhaps Cerinthus) are meant by 1 John 2:18-19: "Even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us but they were not of us," etc. (III, 35).

⁴⁴*Cf.* IV, 170.

⁴⁵*Op. cit.*, II, 30.

⁴⁶*Op. cit.*, III, 39.

Some of the Gnostics of Clement's time claimed that they had already received resurrection, on which account they condemned wedlock, because our Lord had said that in the life to come there would be no marrying or giving in marriage." Also he charges the Gnostics with avoiding martyrdom. They said "true *witnessship* [μαρτυρία] is the insight into the real God"—a device of cowardice, Clement said. Here is a striking example of their manipulation of Scripture. In the Sermon on the Mount our Lord said (Matt. 5:10): "Blessed are they which are persecuted *for righteousness' sake*, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης). The Gnostics changed the wording to ὑπὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης—"Blessed are they who are persecuted *by justice*, for they shall be perfect" (ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἔσονται τέλειοι). Basilides, the Gnostic leader, was even a more thoroughgoing Platonist (than Clement himself) in suggesting that the soul, for its former sinning in another life, was enduring its castigation here, in the present life, the elect through martyrdom, with honor, and the others in being purged through their own punishment. Basilides also said that Jesus at bottom was a sinful man like the rest of mankind." Prodikos, the leader of still another Gnostic sect, rejects prayer (VII, 41), whereas Clement designates the Christian thinker as him who alone is pious and godfearing, who is indeed endowed with deeper insight "in conformity with the standard of the church" (κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα, *Ibid.*).

Now it seems that to the Jews and the Greeks the Gnostic sects appeared as genuine parts of

⁴¹*Op. cit.*, III, 48, 87.

⁴²*Op. cit.*, IV, 16, 41, 83, 85.

Christendom. The great number of these divisions and the contentions bred thereby were indeed alleged by Hebrews and Gentiles as a hindrance to their acceptance of Christ. Clement calls the Gnostics the tares among the wheat, and adverts to the different sects in the record of Greek philosophy—not a very felicitous parallel, I think. Again we meet that conservative note in the presbyter: “Even if others transgress *the agreements*, still it behooves us in no wise to transgress the standard set by the church.

* * * And especially do we guard the agreement concerning the greatest things [articles of faith], but they transgress it.” “They” are the Gnostics obviously. Even among physicians, Clement argues, are there sects; must one therefore forswear all medical treatment? And the Christians, by test of both doctrine and conduct as well, must be like the coin that rings true.”

We see, then, in concluding this study, that, whatever speculative syncretism was in the propaedeutic of Clement, where the issue was the positive self-definition, the doctrinal self-determination of the church as over against the innumerable forms of dissent, and the evaporation of the Gospel into the nebulous shapes and glittering soap bubbles of Gnosticism, *there Clement had to take his stand with the church*. We close with some words of Clement's own: “But there being a process of demonstration, it is necessary to join in descending to the enquiries, and *through the Scriptures themselves* to learn in a manner of cogent proof [ἀποδεικτικῶς] how the sects have failed, and how, in truth alone and *in the ancient church* [there is] both the most accurate insight and really the best sect.”

⁴⁰*Op. cit.*, VII, 89, 90.

THE BOOK OF REVELATION

By REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D. D., Wycliffe College, Toronto

THERE is, perhaps, no book in the New Testament as to which there are greater differences of opinion. Yet, as attention is so frequently, and at present so specially, concentrated on it, it seems necessary to endeavor to discover its meaning and purpose, especially in view of what is its unique feature among New Testament books, the promise of a blessing on the reader and hearer of "the words of this prophecy" (1:3). In view of these differences and difficulties, it is probably best to provide material for study rather than to give conclusions which would not be convincing to all readers.

I. INTRODUCTION

The New Testament, as a record of divine revelation, is concerned with the past, the present, and the future. It includes a consideration of the Person of Christ in the Gospels, of the Church of Christ in the Acts and Epistles, and of the Rule of Christ in the Apocalypse. Thus, to use a well-known simile, we have respectively the foundation, the structure, and the completely furnished house. Or, to put it otherwise, the New Testament makes its appeal to Faith, to Love, and to Hope.

There would thus be a distinct incompleteness without this book of the Revelation, which corresponds to the prophecies of the Old Testament. Some, however, are deterred from studying it by reason of its difficulties; but, while these are real, they should not hinder us from giving the book the best attention pos-

sible. A blessing is assured to those who read, hear, and understand its message (1:3), and we know that even Old Testament prophets did not understand their own words, but were constantly endeavoring to discover the meaning (1 Pet. 1:10; 2 Pet. 1:19).

As to the *authorship*, there does not seem to be any valid reason for departing from the tradition of the church in regard to the Apostle John. The substance and claim of the book also point in this direction.

The *date* is now usually regarded as that of the time of the Emperor Domitian, near the close of the first century.

The *title* is The Revelation of Jesus Christ, meaning the revelation which was received by Christ from God for us and given through angels by John. It is a "revelation" of His glory in relation to the world, the unveiling of the future in and through Him. It is thus a book which emphasizes Him and calls attention to Him in all the glory of His divine Person and universal sway.

Its *character* is that of a book of visions. "I saw" occurs over forty times. It is symbolical, a book which "signifies" (1:1), a communication by means of "signs."

II. ANALYSIS

It is important to gain an idea of the actual contents before proceeding to the interpretation of the book. It will be helpful to compare analyses by several writers.

1. Many, perhaps most writers, think that 1:19 provides a key to the book in its three divisions, with introduction (1:1-9) and conclusion (22:5-21):

- (a) Things Seen (1:10-20).
- (b) Things that Are (2-3).
- (c) Things that Shall Be (4:1-22:5).

2. A clear and useful outline, and valuable as at any rate provisional, is by Rev. W. Graham Scroggie:

- | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----------------------|
| (a) | 1:1-8. | Introduction. |
| (b) | 1:9-3:22. | Vision of Grace. |
| (c) | 4:1-19:10. | Vision of Government. |
| (d) | 19:11-22:5. | Vision of Glory. |
| (e) | 22:5-21. | Conclusion. |

3. Another by a well-known writer, Walter Scott, is as follows:

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--|
| (a) | 1:1-8. | Introduction. |
| (b) | 1:9-20. | Things Seen. |
| (c) | 2-3. | Things that Are. |
| (d) | 4:1-11:18.
11:19-20:3. | The Period of the Great Tribulation (the second section being coterminous with but an elaboration of the first). |
| (e) | 20:4-15. | The Period of the Millennium. |
| (f) | 21:1-22:5. | The Post-millennial Period. |

4. A writer of another school, Rev. E. H. Horne, divides it by concentrating attention on the repeated phrase, "it is done," and the opening of Heaven, giving three main parts:

- | | | |
|-----|-------------|---------------------|
| (a) | 4:1-16:17. | The Present Age. |
| (b) | 19:11-20:6. | The Millennial Age. |
| (c) | 21-22. | The Eternal Age. |

5. One comes from a thoughtful and able scholar on these subjects, the late Dr. Bullinger (*The Day of the Lord*):

- | | | |
|-----|------------|---|
| (a) | 1. | Introduction. |
| (b) | 2-3. | God's People on Earth. |
| (c) | 4:1-20:15. | Fourteen Visions in Seven Pairs Alternating between Heaven and Earth. |
| (d) | 21:1-22:5. | God's People on the New Earth. |
| (e) | 22:6-21. | Conclusion. |

6. An American student of prophecy, Rev. W. J. Erdman, D. D., has given an analysis which is deserving of notice because of its great clearness and fulness:

1. The Seven Churches

- | | | |
|-----|-----------|---------------------|
| (a) | 1:1-8. | The Prologue. |
| (b) | 1:9-20. | The Son of Man. |
| (c) | 2:1-3:22. | The Seven Churches. |

2. The Seven Seals

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------|---------------|--|
| (a) | 4:1-5:14. | Introduction. | The Throne, the Lamb,
and the Book. |
| (b) | 6:1-17. | Progression. | The Six Seals. |
| (c) | 7:1-17. | Episode. | The Sealed and the
Saved. |
| (d) | 8:1. | Consummation. | The Seventh Seal. |

3. The Seven Trumpets

- | | | | |
|-----|-------------|---------------|--|
| (a) | 8:2-5. | Introduction. | The Angel and In-
cense. |
| (b) | 8:6-9:21. | Progression. | The Six Trumpets. |
| (c) | 10:1-11:14. | Episode. | The Angel, the Little
Book, the Two Wit-
nesses. |
| (d) | 11:15-19. | Consummation. | The Seventh Trumpet. |

4. The Seven Personages

- | | | | |
|-----|-------------|---------------|---|
| (a) | 12:1-13:1a. | Introduction. | The Two Signs in
Heaven. |
| (b) | 13:1b-18. | Progression. | The Great Tribula-
tion. |
| (c) | 14:1-13. | Episode. | The First Fruits and
the Three Angels. |
| (d) | 14:14-20. | Consummation. | The Harvest and the
Vintage. |

5. The Seven Vials

(a)	15:1-8.	Introduction.	The Overcomers and the Seven Angels.
(b)	16:1-12.	Progression.	The Six Vials.
(c)	16:13-16.	Episode.	The Gathering of the Kings.
(d)	16:17-21.	Consummation.	The Seventh Vial.

6. The Seven Dooms

(a)	17:1-18.	Introduction.	The Babylon and the Beast.
(b)	18:1-24.	Progression.	The Doom of Baby- lon.
(c)	19:1-10.	Episode.	The Four Hallel.
(d)	19:11-20:15.	Consummation.	The Six Final Dooms.

7. The Seven New Things

(a)	21:1-8.	Introduction.
(b)	21:9-22:5.	The New Jerusalem.
(c)	22:6-21.	The Epilogue.

Dr. Erdman says this analysis is an attempt to group the contents of the book according to what seem to be the lines of its structure. Also that the so-called three episodes are in each instance both retrospective and prospective.

But while these outlines will help toward a mastery of the actual contents, the analysis will depend very largely on the interpretation which is given to the book.

III. METHODS OF INTERPRETATION

The main lines of explanation must now be given:

1. *Preterist.*

This regards the entire book as fulfilled in the past, within the time of the Roman Empire and in the

life of the Apostle John, with special reference to A.D. 70. This is the view taken in two books: *The Parousia*, by Dr. Russell, an English Congregational minister; and *The Christ Has Come*, by E. Hampden Cook.

The question arises whether this view is really possible. It was not known in the early church. It must be confessed that it is often (though not in the two writers named above) associated with rationalism and antismaterialism. And it seems to indicate the despair of interpretation, according to the analogy of the Old Testament with its detailed prophecies, both fulfilled and unfulfilled.

2. *Idealist.*

This understands the book as one of great principles, symbolically stated, with special reference to the persecution of the church. It is thus a record of conflict and victory. A general view of the book on this interpretation would be:

- (a) Introduction (1).
- (b) The Church in History (2-3).
- (c) Victory Anticipated (4-5).
- (d) Great Judgments (6-16).
- (e) Victory Accomplished (17-19).
- (f) The Church Perfected (20:1-22:5).
- (g) Conclusion (22:6-21).

This is the view associated with three books by Dr. Milligan, the volume in Schaff's *Commentary on Revelation*, *The Revelation*, and the volume in the *Expositor's Bible*; and with Bishop Boyd Carpenter in Cassell's *Commentary*.

Now there is undoubted truth in this view, but it may be seriously questioned whether by itself it is specific enough. Also, the relation of the book to the

Old Testament and the connection and analogy with prophecies there would seem to demand something more definite. As the book is prophetic, it should be regarded and interpreted as such.

A recent writer who may perhaps be included in this school, though he has distinctive features of his own, is Provost Erskine Hill, in *Apocalyptic Problems*. Up to the present time the treatment of only the first half of the Revelation has appeared, though its general line may be easily understood. To Mr. Erskine Hill the book is timeless and records the view of the angels about the various spiritual movements of all time. He does not identify this or that part with any historical period, past or present, nor does he allow a future specific application. The message of the book is said to be that "it reveals the power of self-sacrifice to solve the mystery of pain, and the power of the Living Christ to give His followers protection from all evil, and victory over all temptation" (p. 4). He thus faces the important question of the symbolism and its difficulties: "Imagine a learned scientist trying to explain the mysteries of wireless telegraphy to some untutored aboriginal tribe. The teacher would be confronted with the double difficulty of the crudity of his hearers' minds, and the extremely limited nature of their vocabulary" (p. 14). He is afraid of materializing Christ's sayings about the Advent, and he interprets the eagles of Matthew 24 as spiritual insight (p. 49f.). The "sealed book" of chapter 5 is taken "to represent the problem of the existence of suffering in the world and the toleration of the sin which lies behind so much of it" (p. 91). But perhaps the most striking argument is his dealing with the "Coming of the Son of Man." In regard to the assertion of Christ in Matthew

10:23: "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come," Mr. Hill thinks it refers to our Lord's first coming: "His Coming as Son of Man to the world of men was still an event of the future" (p. 56). "It was in His Mystical Body and on the Day of Pentecost that His first Coming as the Son of Man to the world took place" (p. 59). It is interesting that "coming" in the papyri is almost a technical term.

3. *Historicist.*

This is the interpretation which regards the book from chapters 6-19 as a continuous revelation of the centuries of the Christian church, and it is thought that the fulfilment has now extended to the sixth vial (16). According to this view the Euphrates (16:12) symbolizes the Turkish power, the Reformation is referred to in chapter 10, and the papacy in chapters 17-18. Many great, honored, and scholarly names are associated with this view, including those of E. B. Elliott and Grattan Guinness.

The serious objections raised to this interpretation include the following:

(a) Is it likely that a knowledge of history would be required before an ordinary Christian could understand this book?

(b) Is it possible to interpret a passage like 6:12-17 of anything, however terrible, that has already taken place? The great day of the wrath of the Lamb, it is urged, cannot be predicated of any event in the course of Christian history.

(c) If past wars are carefully recorded in the book, how is it that the present war, the greatest in history, finds no place in it?

(d) Notwithstanding the remarkable agreement on many points, there are also great differences between writers of this school, and these seem to many to show the impossibility of identifying the references with historical events. Thus in interpreting the second trumpet (8:8, 9), the following various interpretations have been given:

The fiery mountain means Satan; Genseric; a great heresy; Vespasian; the Prelacy; Rome.

The sea means the nations; the Church with its baptismal waters; the Sea of Galilee; pure doctrine.

The destruction of the fishes means the slaughter of Christians; the Jews; the Vandals; monks.

To the same effect are some recent words of Rev. W. Graham Scroggie, who has pointed out how "the most distinguished exponents of this school hopelessly differ among themselves." He gave these instances:

Elliott interprets the sixth seal of Constantine, but Faber sees in it the French Revolution.

Bengel sees in the star fallen from heaven (10) a good angel, but Elliott regards it as Mohammed.

Mede takes the locusts of chapter 9, which torment men for five months, to mean one hundred and fifty years of the dominion of the Saracens; but

Vitringa says they mean the Goths and the Jesuits.

Mr. Scroggie reasonably adds: "So long as there is such variance as that among those whose general view is the same, dogmatism should be avoided."

The newest book based on this line of interpretation is *The Revelation of Jesus Christ*, by H. C. Williams, in which the writer regards the Apocalypse as giving a threefold view of the future, each part ending with our Lord's coming. After the preliminary division in chapter 1, the book is divided thus:

(a) 2-3, regarded as descriptive of the whole period of the church's history, culminating with the promise of Christ's coming (3:11, 20).

(b) 4-11, again culminating in the full realization of victory through the coming of Christ (11:15-17).

(c) 12-19, with a third reference to the coming of Christ (19:11-16).

The last two chapters are descriptive of the heavenly life of eternity, following the advent of Christ.

The general treatment is that of the Historicist School, though the writer has interpretations of his own which differ from those generally adopted by this prophetic school. He, too, makes much of the papacy as representing the Antichrist, but he is possibly too apt to see the allusions to his own denomination in certain parts of the book, thereby confusing between primary interpretation and spiritual application.

4. *Futurist.*

This, in general, means that, while chapters 2-3 refer to the present age, everything after 4:1 is still future, and will probably take only about seven years to fulfil, a time corresponding to the seventieth week of Daniel. On this view the church will have gone from the earth, 1 Thessalonians 4 being fulfilled between chapters 3 and 4. The material from chapter 4 to chapter 19 is regarded as giving a series of pictures rather than a chronological sequence. One writer, Walter Scott, thinks that 4:1-11:18 is parallel with 11:19-20:3, the second emphasizing details of the first. Great names are also associated with this interpretation, including those of Seiss, B. W. Newton, J. N. Darby, Sir Robert Anderson, and many more.

The view is objected to by adherents of the other schools, especially the Historical, on several grounds,
e. g.:

(a) Is it likely that the whole course of Christian history would be disregarded?

(b) How can the word "shortly" be interpreted on this view?

In view of all these differences of position, the student must face the question for himself, and, meanwhile, some of the matters calling for consideration may be mentioned.

IV. SOME PROBLEMS

As a help to the interpretation, the following questions call for careful consideration:

1. Does 1:10 refer to the "Lord's Day" (Sunday, the first day of the week) or to "the day of the Lord" (the future)? Many, perhaps most, favor the former, but, on the other hand, it is urged:

(a) 1:9ff. refers to St. John being "in the spirit," and this, with other references, seems to indicate a vision of the future (4:2; 17:3; 21:10; cf. Ezek. 11:1; 37:1; 40:2).

(b) The title, "Lord's Day," for Sunday is not found so early as this date.

(c) The origin of the term, Lord's Day, is pagan, not Christian. In pagan Rome the first day of the week was called *Dominica* (the lord's), to which was to be added *Sol*, the sun; or in Hebrew, *Baal*, lord.

The important point which turns on this interpretation is that in the latter view the whole book, including chapters 1-3, would be future, and it is urged that this is borne out by the references to the book as prophetic (1:3; 22:19; cf. 11:6; 19:10; 22:7, 10, 18).

2. Does 1:19 really indicate a division of the book? Many writers of different schools urge this and say that it is unthinkable that there should not be some-

thing of and for the past and present in the book, even though it be only chapters 1-3.

But Alford and others render the words thus: "What thou sawest and what they *are*" (*i. e.*, signify). This is urged in the light of 1:20, where "are" certainly means signify.

One proof alleged in favor of this interpretation and at the same time in support of the view that the messages to the seven churches refer to the same period as that covered by the remainder of the book is that the visions from chapter 4 onward throw light on the spiritual history of the period from without, as the messages themselves throw light on the spiritual history of the churches from within. It is urged that there is a connection between the sevenfold series of visions and the seven churches, and the following conspectus is given:

The Ephesus Church (2:1-7).	In the midst seven stars in right hand; threat to remove lampstand out of its place.
The Ephesus Period (4:1-7:3).	In the midst seven-sealed book in right hand; seven lamps, eyes, spirits; mountains and islands "moved" (same word as above) out of their places.
The Smyrna Church (2:8-11).	Tribulation; faithful unto death; second death; hurt.
The Smyrna Period (7:9-11:14).	The great tribulation; two witnesses slain; death; slay; hurt.
The Pergamos Church (2:12-17)	Hold fast my name; Satan's throne; the hidden manna; the doctrine of Balaam.
The Pergamos Period (11:15-19).	Fear thy name; the kingdoms of this world become Christ's.

The Thyatira Church (2:18-29).	The woman Jezebel; the morning star; the rod of iron; depths of Satan; keep works; faith and patience; false prophetess; her children killed.
The Thyatira Period (12-13).	Woman clothed with sun; the twelve stars; the rod of iron; Satan; keep commandment; patience and faith; false prophet; God's children killed.
The Sardis Church (3:1-6).	A few with undefiled garments; "they shall walk with me in white"; name confessed before the Father.
The Sardis Period (14).	144,000 not defiled; they follow the Lamb; without fault before the throne of God.
The Philadelphia Church (3:7-13).	Worship before thee; a pillar in the temple; the name of the city of God—new Jerusalem; the trying of them that dwell on the earth; the hour; I will keep thee out of the hour.
The Philadelphia Period (15-18).	Worship before thee; the temple; the great city Babylon; they that dwell on the earth; one hour; come out, My people.
The Laodicea Church (3:14-22).	White raiment; supper; faithful and true; Amen; spue out of mouth; sit in My throne; stand at door.
The Laodicea Period (19-20).	Fine linen; marriage supper; faithful and true; the word of God; out of his mouth a sword; set on throne; the Judge.

There is certainly a close comparison at many points, but whether it is close enough to prove interrelation will be a matter of opinion. But the view seems suggestive enough to provoke further study.

3. What is the interpretation of the messages to the seven churches (2-3)? They must have had a primary meaning for the churches addressed.¹

Some consider that the seven sections represent seven periods of church history to the present day. But

¹See Ramsay's *Seven Churches of Asia*.

there is great difference of opinion as to the divisions of the periods, and a good deal of arbitrariness is seen in the attempt to make them harmonize with the progress of the history. If they are to be regarded as explanatory of church history, it is more natural to think of them as emphasizing principles which are necessary all through the age. Thus, the loss of the first love and the consequent need of repentance in the first church are certainly true of much Christianity to-day.

Others say that the spirit of the message is so unlike that of the church teaching of the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians that it is impossible to think of these messages as applicable to a New Testament church. On this view, the whole book being future, the churches refer to some communities of believers, Jewish probably, which will be on the earth after the church, the body of Christ, has been taken away.

4. Are the seals, trumpets, and vials continuous (twenty-one), or parallel (three sevens)? One thing of interest, and perhaps of importance, is that the six seals correspond very closely to the Olivet discourses of Matthew 24:4-11:

False Christs, Matthew 24:5.	First seal, Revelation 6:1, 2.
War, " 24:6, 7.	Second seal, " 6:3, 4.
Famine, " 24:7.	Third seal, " 6:5, 6.
Pestilence, " 24:7.	Fourth seal, " 6:7, 8.
Afflictions, " 24:9.	Fifth seal, " 6:9-11.
Earthquakes, " 24:7.	Sixth seal, " 6:12.

Milligan elaborates this parallel with great force and suggests that the Apocalypse is John's version of the Olivet discourses. If this is true, the seals, trumpets, and vials are coterminous and represent different aspects of the same judgment.

Dr. Gray refers to the Biblical law of recurrence, by which an outline is first given and then details follow. He illustrates this from Isaiah 1, which he thinks covers the whole of Isaiah's work, and then the same is given in detail as in chapters 2-4. And so, on this view, the seals (4-7), trumpets (8-14), and vials (15-18) are a parallel, the sixth seal being coterminous with the seventh trumpet (11:17, 18). Then the seventh seal goes back and starts a new series of judgments in the seven trumpets and the seven vials, chapter 20 being concerned with the final judgment. Hence the rest of the Apocalypse comes under the seventh seal (8:7; 18:24). Mr. Graham Scroggie prefers to interpret these sections, not by a recurrence or doubling back, but by the principle of inclusion, the seven trumpets being included in the seventh seal, and the seven vials in the seventh trumpet.

V. SOME GENERAL SUGGESTIONS

The following points will also perhaps help in the study of this book.

1. The Apocalypse cannot be properly understood without a knowledge of Old Testament prophecy, especially Daniel 2. The vision of Christ in Revelation 1 is strikingly like that of Daniel 10, as the following comparison will show:

Daniel 10:5, 6, 8-14.
Behold, one—a man.
Clothed in linen.

Loins girded with fine gold of Uphaz.
His body was like the beryl.

Revelation 1:13-17.
A Son of man.
Clothed with a garment to the foot.
Girt about the paps with a golden girdle.
His head and hair like wool and snow.

His face as the appearance of
lightning.

His eyes as lamps of fire.

His feet like polished brass.

His voice like voice of a
multitude.

There remained no strength in
me: for my comeliness was
turned in me into corruption,

* * * then was I in a
deep sleep on my face, and
my face touched the ground.

And behold a hand touched me,
which set me upon my knees
and the palms of my hands.

Fear not, Daniel.

I am come to make thee un-
derstand what shall befall
thy people in the latter
days.

Shut up the words and seal
the book to the time of the
end (12:4).

It is impossible to question the close parallels here, and if so, it is more than probable that the time, place, and people of both books are the same. "Thy people" would be Israel; "the latter days" bring us to the period of the Revelation, "the day of the Lord." The difference between the two accounts is that Daniel was told to shut up the words and seal the book *to the time of the end*, whereas John is told: "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of the prophecy, and keep those things that are written therein, *for the time is at hand.*"

2. It is urged by some that all the symbols are Jewish, and not one, even the white stone, is Gentile,

His eyes as a flame of fire.

His feet like fine brass.

His voice as the sound of
many waters.

And when I saw him I fell at
his feet as one dead.

He laid his right hand upon
me.

Fear not.

Write the things which thou
hast seen * * * the seven
stars are * * * .

Blessed is he that readeth, and
they that hear * * *
and keep those things that
are written, for the time is
at hand (1:3).

and that it is an essentially Jewish book. If this is so, the interpretation is certainly made easier by the limitation to Jewish life.

3. The recurrence of the sevens is particularly noteworthy, as illustrated in Erdman's outline given above.

4. Careful distinction must be made between the symbolical and the literal elements. While the book is full of Oriental symbolism and imagery, yet the literal interpretation should be given primary place whenever possible. And even the symbols, like figures of speech, express realities.

5. Much depends upon whether the book refers to the church or to the Kingdom. But even if it is impossible to determine this, it is important to remember that church and Kingdom are not identical. The Lord's Prayer alone shows this, for it would be manifestly impossible to substitute church and say: Thy church come. The usage in the Gospels (Kingdom), in Acts (Kingdom and church), in the Epistles (church), and in Revelation (Kingdom) points in the same direction. While the spiritual principles of the Kingdom obtain now, the Kingdom in full reality is not yet revealed, nor will be till the Lord comes. A kingdom is impossible without a king. The church is an instrument for bringing in the Kingdom, but the "Kingdom of God" is far wider than the church and means God's rule over the whole universe.

6. The idea of a double fulfilment of prophecy is worthy of attention. We see something of this in a comparison of Acts 2 with Joel 2, where it is evident that the Day of Pentecost was not a complete fulfilment of Joel's words. There must still be some further realization to give the prophecy its full import.

Then, too, the realization of Malachi 4:5, 6 in John the Baptist does not exhaust the meaning, for the words clearly indicate some further and future fulfilment.

Dr. Scofield, on Matthew 24:4-11, suggests that these words are at once characteristic of the whole of the age and also of the last week of Daniel's vision, which, on this view, is regarded as still future.

Some writers endeavor to blend the Historical and Futurist views by means of a primary and secondary fulfilment, one in the present, and the other in the future, but this is difficult and perhaps impossible. At any rate, leading scholars of both schools maintain that the two positions are incompatible.

7. But whatever may be the true interpretation of the book as a whole, there are two points on which it is possible for all to agree and in this agreement to obtain much spiritual profit from the study.

(a) The first of these is suggested by the title, The Revelation of Jesus Christ. It is a book which unveils, not conceals, the Lord. It is full of Him, and the thoughtful student will not fail to see that He is the subject and substance of every part. The following outline, adapted from one by the Rev. W. Graham Scroggie, will show how full the book is of Christ:

I. The Manifestations of Christ.

1. Personal.

(a) His Deity.

(b) His humanity.

(c) The God-man.

2. Official.

3. Dispensational.

II. The Messages of Christ.

1. The passages.

2. The teaching.
3. The standpoint.

III. The Relations of Christ.

1. His relation to Heaven.
 - (a) To the Father.
 - (b) To the Spirit.
 - (c) To unfallen angels.
2. His relation to earth.
 - (a) To the wicked.
 - (b) To the righteous.
3. His relation to hell.
 - (a) To the devil.
 - (b) To demons.

IV. The Work of Christ.

1. In the church (chastening).
2. In Israel (restoring).
3. In the world (judging).

V. The Victories of Christ.

1. The fruit of His cross.
2. The establishment of His Kingdom.
3. The overthrow of His enemies.

(b) The second of these points is the remarkable and close connection (by contrast) between the first three or four chapters of Genesis and the last three or four chapters of the Apocalypse. This comparison has often been shown, and the following, taken from *The Apocalypse of Jesus Christ*, by W. W. Mead, is eminently worthy of study and meditation:²

Genesis 1-4 speaks of:

1. The First Creation.
2. The First Sabbath.
3. The First Adam — the Head of the Old Humanity.

Revelation 19-22 speaks of:

1. The New Creation.
2. The holy Rest in the New Creation.
3. The Second Adam—the Head of the New Humanity.

²*Cf.* Companion Bible, Appendix 3.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 4. Eve—the wife of the First Adam, sinning, condemned, sorrowing. | 4. The Second Eve—the Bride of Christ, holy, exalted, glorious, “in exceeding joy.” |
| 5. The Garden of Eden. | 5. The Paradise of God. |
| 6. The Fall of Man. | 6. Man’s full Redemption and Restoration. |
| 7. Sin. | 7. Perfect Holiness. |
| 8. Communion broken. | 8. Communion restored, perfect, eternal. |
| 9. Death. | 9. Eternal Life. |
| 10. The Promise. | 10. Its complete fulfilment. |
| 11. Loss of Eden. | 11. Restoration to the greater bliss of Paradise. |
| 12. Exclusion from the Tree of Life. | 12. Access to and “authority over the Tree of Life.” |
| 13. Earth Cursed. | 13. Earth’s full deliverance from the Curse. |
| 14. Satan in the Garden, tempting and bruising. | 14. Satan bruised, and in the Lake of Fire. |
| 15. The Seed of the Serpent (Cain and his line), dominant, persecuting, building cities, gaining the world. | 15. The Serpent’s Seed—the Antichrist, the False Prophet, and the False Bride, overcome, dispossessed of the Kingdom and cast into the Lake of Fire. |
| 16. The Seed of the Woman (Abel and Seth), persecuted, killed, and of no reputation. | 16. The Seed of the Woman—Christ and His Bride, risen, victorious, triumphant, in the City of God, possessing “the Kingdom and the power and the glory” “unto the ages of the ages.” |

And so in spite of the difficulties, it remains true that a blessing is promised to the reader and student of this book (1:3), and those who have given most attention to it know by experience that the promise is abundantly fulfilled.

EXEGETICAL OUTLINES

EL GIBBOR

ISAIAH 9:6

By DR. WILLIAM H. MARQUESS, Dean of the Bible Teachers Training School

THIS name or title, applied by the prophet to the expected Messiah, has been with both Jew and Gentile the occasion of sharp exegetical discussion. The Authorized Version renders it "The Mighty God." The Revised Version translates it simply "Mighty God," on account of the absence of the article in the Hebrew. The Massoretic text, which as a rule our English versions faithfully follow, has arranged its "accents" in such a way as to put upon the phrase another construction and upon the whole sentence a radically different interpretation. For these accents seem to punctuate the sentence in such a way as to separate the phrase *El Gibbor* and the phrases that precede it from the phrases that follow.

The natural interpretation of this Massoretic text would be: He who is "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, calls his name Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace." So that *El Gibbor* is made a title of Jehovah and the subject of the verb, while to the child who is born there is given only the title, Prince of Peace, and the somewhat obscure title, Father of Eternity. The Massoretic accents are no part of the original text and represent merely a Jewish interpretation, much later than the beginning of the Christian era.

The Jewish Aramaic Version and Targum give practically the same interpretation, and eminent Jewish scholars have adopted this view. Luzzatto, in his great Italian commentary on Isaiah, treats the names as a sentence affirming something of God and nothing of the Son who is to be given. The recent Jewish translation of the Old Testament, issued in 1917 and representing the best modern Jewish thought, renders as follows:

“And His name is called
Pele-joez-el-gibbor-
Abi-ad-sar-shalom.”

The name thus attributed to Messiah is a sentence: “Wonderful in counsel is God the Mighty, the Everlasting Father, the Ruler of peace,” as rendered in their margin. This construes the phrases after the model of Immanuel (God is with us) or Isaiah (Jehovah saves). One looks in vain, however, for any fair analogy to this in the Old Testament, for any instance of a long, cumbersome, complex sentence like this, used as a name. One feels that all such translations are makeshifts, refuges of despair, artificial expedients contrived to evade the application of the term *El Gibbor* to the Messiah. It is safe to say that, if the sentence had not contained this one title, the same would have been accepted as a set of descriptive phrases voicing the hope of Israel regarding her ideal King.

Gentile commentators, averse to the old rendering, have more warily and plausibly sought a different meaning for the phrase *El Gibbor*, and have rendered it: “A godlike hero, a hero-god, a god of a hero, a divine hero.” The meaning is thus pared down to

the idea of a military leader of great prowess, invested with superhuman powers, either poetically or in sober fact. *Gibbor* is a common Hebrew term for "mighty man," is applied to Nimrod as a hunter, to David's three great warriors, and to other men of strength and prowess. *El* is a term applied to the true God, as in Isaiah 12:2, to heathen divinities, as in Deuteronomy 32:12, and to men of authority and might, such as kings and princes, as in Ezekiel 31:11.

Professor H. G. Mitchell urges that the word as used in Hebrew does not connote or suggest an attitude of worship toward a divine being but merely a recognition of superior might, and prefers to translate it by the English word lord. But practically all names of Deity are descriptive of some attribute such as power or authority or goodness or eternity—just as our word God is derived from good. Professor Mitchell can name no word applied to God in Hebrew where the attitude of worship is directly indicated. The etymology of the term *El* determines nothing whatever. We must look to its historic usage and to its particular use in any given context. Isaiah constantly, not to say uniformly, applies it to the true God, and in 31:3 uses it in sharp contrast with the term Adam or man.

We once heard Dr. William R. Harper affirm that the laws of Hebrew syntax would not permit the translation of *El Gibbor* in this passage by the English phrase, "Mighty God." He asserted that the two words were in genitive relation and must be rendered "a god of a hero." Tiglath-Pileser was a hero, but the Messiah would be a god of a hero. The answer to this assertion is the fact that there is nothing whatever to prove that the terms are in genitive relation.

It is true that *Gibbor* is a noun, like *El*, and that the two may be in genitive relation. But it is just as true that a noun in the Hebrew was often placed in apposition or adjective relation after another noun. So that the renderings: "A god, a hero," "a god, a mighty one," or "a god mighty" are as truly in accord with the usages of Hebrew syntax as the rendering "a god of a hero."

In Daniel 11:3 the phrase, *Melech Gibbor*, is used. No one insists on translating this "a king of a hero." The context shows plainly that *Gibbor* is used as an adjective, and that we are to understand the pair of words to mean "a mighty king." This one instance is a fact that shatters the argument for the theory of a genitive relation in Isaiah 9:6, and confirms the soundness and accuracy of the English versions.

The same phrase, *El Gibbor*, is again used in Isaiah 10:21, and is most naturally construed as referring to Jehovah: "A remnant shall return unto El Gibbor." This is rendered in the Revised Version: "Unto the mighty God." Some insist that the term is here used as a proper name, like Immanuel in 7 and 8, and is an echo of the Messianic title of 9:6. But the fact that the preceding verse declares that the remnant shall lean on Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel, makes it far more natural to take the term as referring to Deity, especially as in earlier passages Isaiah has described God as the Mighty One.

The root of the objections to the natural rendering of the passage in 9:6 is a conviction that a monotheist like Isaiah could not have applied such a title to a man, even the Messiah. But it is undeniable that the prophets frequently identified the Messiah with Jehovah in very strange and startling ways. Not to

speak of the way in which they attributed to the Angel of Jehovah names and powers and prerogatives peculiar to Deity, there is the remarkable address to a Messianic King in Psalm 45:6, the only honest translation of which is: "Thy throne, O God." And there is the puzzling fact with which our Lord pressed His adversaries, the fact that David called his descendant his Lord.

This phrase *El Gibbor*, which in Deuteronomy 10:17; Nehemiah 9:32; and Jeremiah 32:18, is applied to Jehovah (the article being used in these cases), is here applied to the Messiah. This does not indicate that Isaiah understood the doctrine of the Deity of the Messiah, as revealed in the New Testament. It shows, however, that he, like other prophets, was led to expect in the coming Messianic Prince an unusual and unique manifestation of divine power, an extraordinary and unparalleled exercise of divine prerogatives. In what way this strange and mysterious relation to Jehovah could and would exist, the prophets were unable to understand. No doubt they asked themselves such perplexing questions as that which Jesus put to the Pharisees about Psalm 110, and such as, according to Peter, they asked concerning the meaning of their own prophecies in relation to the sufferings and glories of the Messiah. Unconsciously they were guided by the Spirit of God to such a portraiture of the coming Messiah as would become luminous in the light of the later fact of His Incarnation, His union of "two distinct natures in one Person." Here, as elsewhere, the Old Testament prophet "builded better than he knew."

ΑΓΡΥΠΝΕΙΝ

LUKE 21:36.

By JAMES COFFIN STOUT, Professor of Greek Exegesis, Bible Teachers Training School

IN our versions two words are uniformly translated "to watch," ἀγρυπνεῖν and γρηγορεῖν. The latter is much the more frequent word, ἀγρυπνεῖν being found in but four passages—Mark 13:33; Luke 21:36; Ephesians 6:18; and Hebrews 13:17. Both words are rooted in the idea of sleeplessness, or rather, wakefulness, and there is little to distinguish them in meaning. In popular usage they seem to have been close synonyms, and in Mark 13:33-37 they are apparently used interchangeably.

If any shade of difference is to be felt, it is perhaps suggested by the process by which γρηγορεῖν attained its independent existence in the vocabulary of the Greeks. It is formed from ἐγρήγορα, second perfect of ἐγείρω, and therefore, to borrow Thayer's phrase, signifies "to have been roused from sleep." Just as οἶδα, literally, "I have seen" (second perfect from εἶδω), developed into a new verb which embodied in a present form that which is the peculiarity of the perfect tense—a completed past action viewed from the standpoint of its continuing significance—and "I have seen" became "I know," so γρηγορεῖν pictures its thought against the background of a definite act of arousing from sleep, and transmutes "I have been roused from sleep" into "I am awake." Thus γρηγορεῖν is a more vehement word than ἀγρυπνεῖν, and suggests a watchfulness which results from effort, an arousement, "a mindfulness of threatening dangers (cf.

Proverbs 23:34), which, with conscious earnestness and mind on the alert, keep from it all drowsiness and all slackening in the energy of faith and conduct" (Cremer).

Ἀγρυπνεῖν, on the other hand, seems to refer to an attentive attitude rather than to an arousement which results from conscious effort. Thayer quotes Green, *Critical Notes on the New Testament*: "Ἀγρυπνεῖν may be taken to express simply * * * absence of sleep, * * * and thence a wakeful frame of mind as opposed to listlessness; while γρηγορεῖν (the offspring of ἐγρηγόρα) represents a waking state as the effect of some arousing effort."

This conception of an attitude of mind and of life which is *the opposite of listlessness* seems to have been the final and crowning impression which our Lord sought to bring to His disciples in regard to the fact of His second coming, as He spoke the solemn words of Luke 21. And that this watchful, unsleeping attitude must control *both mind and life* is evident from the twofold connection in which the injunction, "Take heed," occurs in the passage: (1) "Take heed *that ye be not led astray*," verses 8ff.; that is, take heed of wrong *thinking*; and (2) "Take heed *to yourselves*," verse 34; that is, take heed of wrong *living*.

To the Christian, indifference to or lack of interest in the blessed hope of our Lord's return is simply unthinkable. For some, indeed, "Watch ye" may have to mean an "arousing effort," which with definite, "conscious earnestness" shakes off a condition of spiritual carelessness and neglect (γρηγορεῖν); but for all, "Take heed that ye be not led astray" and "Take heed to yourselves" will lead to such an attitude of

prayerful alertness and expectancy, both in our thinking and in our living, as shall enable us with the spirit and the understanding to sing:

A lamp in the night, a song in time of sorrow;
A great glad hope which faith can ever borrow
To gild the passing day with the glory of the morrow,
Is the hope of the coming of the Lord.

A call of command, like trumpet clearly sounding,
To make us bold when evil is surrounding;
To stir the sluggish heart and to keep in good abounding,
Is the hope of the coming of the Lord.

LITERARY REVIEWS

[Authors and publishers are requested not to send either books, periodicals or pamphlets for review. The editor prefers to select and purchase whatever is to be reviewed in these pages.—EDITOR.]

DR. WALKER'S HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH¹

IN the opening and closing sentences of this book we have a definition of the method and an indication of the spirit of the author as he approached his task. The first paragraph of the Prefatory Note reads as follows:

"In this history the writer has endeavored to treat the vast field of the story of the church so as to make evident, as far as he is able, the circumstances of its origin, its early development, the changes which led to the Reformation, as well as the course of that tremendous upheaval, and those influences which have resulted in the present situation and tendencies of the life of the church. As far as space would permit he has directed attention to the growth of doctrine and the modification of Christian thought."

Here the scope of the book and the method of treatment of the subject are succinctly stated. The closing paragraph of the volume reveals the attitude of the author toward his work, and the spirit of the devout believer as he told the story which meant so much to his faith.

"The long story of the Christian Church is a panorama of lights and shadows, of achievement and failure, of conquests and divisions. It has exhibited the divine life marvellously transforming the lives of men. It has also exhibited those passions and weaknesses of which human nature is capable. Its tasks have seemed, in every age, almost insuperable. They were never greater than at present when confronted by a materialistic interpretation of life, and when the furnace of almost universal war

¹A History of the Christian Church, by Williston Walker, D. D. New York, 1918. Pp. 624.

bids fair to transform the whole fabric of European and American civilization. Yet no Christian can survey what the church has done without confidence in its future. Its changes may be many, its struggles great. But the good hand of God which has led it hitherto will guide it to larger usefulness in the advancement of the kingdom of its Lord, and toward the fullfilment of His prediction that if He be lifted up He would draw all men unto Him."

We instinctively feel that it will be a high privilege to follow the lead of such a teacher, and the clearly defined program which he marks out for himself and his book allure the mind. And all who are acquainted with Professor Walker as a man and as a writer will be assured of the scholarly quality of the work which they may expect to find in a volume which bears his name.

In passing from the Prefatory Note to the Table of Contents one's interest is at once piqued. The periods into which the writer divides the history of the church are rather unusually made and phrased. They are seven in number, and, even in a brief review, justify the taking of space for their enumeration:

Period I. From the Beginnings to the Gnostic Crisis.

Period II. From the Gnostic Crisis to Constantine.

Period III. The Imperial State Church.

Period IV. The Middle Ages to the Close of the Investiture Controversy.

Period V. The Later Middle Ages.

Period VI. The Reformation.

Period VII. The Transition to the Modern Religious Situation.

From this analysis of the subject, Professor Walker's evident interest in the more doctrinal and philosophical aspects of church history will readily be discerned; and the chapter titles which, within the scope of these major divisions, describe the progress of his book still more fully reveal this.

One cannot but wonder whether this point of view was the wise one to adopt in preparing a church history which must cover the whole field in a single volume. The material is so voluminous, the necessity for economy of space so inexorable,

the task so difficult, that the historian can scarcely hope satisfactorily and adequately to enter also the fields of theology, exegesis, and New Testament introduction. For instance, Professor Walker asserts his opinion that Mark's Gospel came into existence "probably not far from 75-80," Matthew and Luke "probably between 80-90," and attributes the Johannine Gospel "to the period 95-110" (p. 34f.), while on page 48 he dates the writing of 1 Peter at "about 90." These, and other matters of critical introduction which are quite confidently pronounced upon, seem to this reviewer outside the province of the church historian, especially when the limitations of space forbid a defence and justification of affirmations with respect to matters which are still recognized as debatable.

Similar objection may perhaps be felt in regard to some of the excursions which our author makes into the field of New Testament exegesis. It seems a little hazardous to build historical conclusions upon any one interpretation of passages whose meaning scientific exegesis still finds it impossible conclusively to settle. As when, for instance, on page 94, 1 Corinthians 15:29 is cited as proving that Paul's converts in Corinth "held an almost magical conception of the rite [of baptism], being baptized in behalf of their dead friends that the departed might be benefited thereby."

These, and other questions of method, emphasize the immense difficulty of the task of a historian, whose quest is essentially and always within the realm of facts, and yet whose material is never simply facts, but always facts as they have been interpreted in life. Even when endeavoring to compress the story of the Christian centuries into the narrow limits of a single volume, his compendium of history must never be a mere chronicle, it must thrill with the throbbing vitality of life, it must be interesting with that sort of interest which only a vision of the thinking, believing, aspiring heart of man can give. Herein lies the difficulty. If too much be attempted in the realm of theological and philosophical interpretation, the vitalizing elements of incident and illustration must of necessity be omitted.

One of the most satisfying portions of Professor Walker's book is that which deals with the history of the Protestant Reformation; as he himself phrases it in the Prefatory Note

already quoted: "The changes which led to the Reformation, as well as the course of that tremendous upheaval." In view of our author's volume on this subject in the Ten Epochs of Church History Series, nothing else than a fine treatment of the material was to be expected. Nor is the reader disappointed in this anticipation. Moreover, that the story of the Reformation should be well told is in itself a feature of outstanding excellence in any church history, in view of its supreme character in relation to all modern developments; and it is not surprising that the writer should pass to "the present situation and tendencies of the life of the church" through a seventh period, entitled "The Transition to the Modern Religious Situation." Thus the intimate relation between the Reformation and modern Christianity is properly emphasized.

In estimating the value of a church history, one naturally turns from the method of treating the Reformation to the discussion of the all-important developments of the period of the Ecumenical Councils. Professor Walker does this under the title "The Imperial State Church," and in this title reveals the point of view from which he approaches the whole situation. This certainly has its justification in the policy of imperial interference with matters ecclesiastical and doctrinal which began with Constantine. It seems possible, however, that the deeper ecclesiastical issues involved would be more apparent to the average reader if the inevitableness of the doctrinal controversies, apart entirely from state interference, had been more clearly traced to the need within the church itself for an adequate formulation of its faith.

Indeed, one cannot but wish that, from the standpoint of method in the presentation of historical material, certain features of the book had been differently treated. There is a regrettable lack of those incidental touches which add the atmosphere of living reality to a narrative which is otherwise so satisfyingly complete. The attractiveness of well-authenticated anecdote, the inspiration of sympathy-arousing, faith-quickenings incident—these are withheld, possibly from consciousness of limited space. The mechanical arrangement of the material on the pages also militates against ease of access. The infrequency of explanatory sub-titles and the absence of any thought-directing insets as the paragraphs

and pages proceed detract greatly from the possibilities of lucidity. One needs a considerable previous acquaintance with the facts of church history in order to appreciate the excellencies of Professor Walker's work, and must himself supply a broad background of detail of information in order to maintain an unflagging interest.

The book is a model of the printer's art. Its typographical qualities add materially to one's pleasure in its perusal, and many a reader will feel himself to be indebted both to the author and to the publisher.

JAMES COFFIN STOUT.

ARAM AND ISRAEL¹

THIS study of the Aramaeans in Syria and Mesopotamia was issued in the spring of the present year. It is the thirteenth volume in the series of Oriental Studies edited by Professor Richard J. A. Gottheil under the auspices of the University. The author dedicates the book in a simple and affectionate way to "his parents, first and best of teachers."

He disclaims modestly any ability to write a genuine history of the Aramaeans, since "Through the gloom that enshrouds their destinies our sources only now and then cast a fitful glimmer." "Flashlight pictures, taken here and there, and preserved in papyri or engraved on stone or written on clay" must be pieced together by the chronicler. For "of the Aramaeans we know just enough to give an impressionist design of who they were and what befell them." And the author undertakes "to give merely an account of the fate of the Aramaeans so far as it is entwined with the destiny of the Chosen People."

Dr. Kraeling has gone to the original sources, so far as these exist. He confines his investigations to the period of Assyrian rule, ending with the fall of Nineveh, 606 B.C. The old Aramaic inscriptions of that early period come from northern and central Syria, such as the inscriptions of Aramaean kings of the eighth century B.C., discovered at the foot of the Amanus range, and the stele of Zakir, king of Hamath on the River Orontes. Few such monuments have come down to us. And

¹Aram and Israel (Vol. XIII, Columbia University Oriental Studies), by Emil G. H. Kraeling. New York, 1918. Pp. 155.

we are dependent chiefly on contemporaneous records in other tongues, almost entirely on the cuneiform records of Babylonia and Assyria. Archaic inscriptions from Nippur dated by archeologists in the third millennium B.C., letters of the Hammurapi dynasty and the Amarna age (or as we would say, between the times of Abraham and Moses), later monuments of the various Shalmanesers and Tiglathpileasers, are the main sources of information as to the history and geography of the Aramaean states.

The author puts next in importance to these sources the Old Testament. The value of its testimony he discounts to some extent because of his acceptance of the critical theory of the Old Testament history and literature, "made in Germany" and still swaying the liberal circles of thought. He thinks that "the exact nature of the events" narrated in the Old Testament "cannot always be fully determined, because most of the documents are quite far removed from the happenings that they narrate," and "the historical reminiscences concerning Aram's relations to Israel preserved in this great treasury of ancient lore are seldom contemporaneous" (p. 4). The fact that "the Hebrew writers did not aspire to write a history of the heathen peoples round about" and that "when they refer to them, it is merely a matter of accident," makes it necessary to "use the Old Testament traditions with the greatest of care." And he suggests that "the accuracy of their information needs to be closely examined," and that "no scholar would presume to make these traditions the basis of a history" (p. 5). In cases "where the account or internal evidence can be shown to be close in point of time to the events related, the standard of accuracy is usually very great. For the writers of Hebrew history were not, like the Assyrian scribes, official chroniclers bent on glorifying their sovereigns. They did not shrink from describing disasters and defeats." On the other hand, however, "their religious bias often, as in the case of Ahab, prevented them from giving a correct estimate of personalities" (p. 4).

The author's study of Ahab in relation to Aram contains no specifications of fact to sustain this charge of religious bias. On the contrary, he mentions the difficulty of harmonizing with our Old Testament narration the account given by the Assyrian inscription of a battle in which Ahab was involved, and says:

"The Hebrew account deserves full credence, the more since Ahab is distasteful to the prophetic narrators, so that an exaggeration of his deeds would not have been allowed to pass into our record unchallenged." Dr. Kraeling holds that "in a surprising number of instances the true course of events is mirrored in the Old Testament," that is to say, "the patriarchal period, beneath the guise of personal adventure, reflects the Aramaean migration and the social life of certain tribes." This childlike and bland habit of using a critical wand to wave Abraham and Jacob and other great historic characters out of existence will probably continue to be a favorite game of certain schools of speculation until some new subject attracts their fancy.

Dr. Kraeling has used his sources "with much assiduity and with great care," as Dr. Gottheil's note avers, and "gathered from the various quarters every scintilla of evidence possible" for his "sketch of the history of those Aramaean groups which are of interest to the study of the Old Testament."

The geographical background is worked out with minute care and painstaking fidelity. The Old Testament terms Aram, Naharaim, and Paddan Aram are still somewhat obscure as to their exact geographical meaning. The origin of the name Aram is shrouded in obscurity. Our author thinks that the Aramaeans came originally from Arabia and appeared first in Chaldea. The migration of Terah from Ur of the Chaldees to Harran he regards as "a reminiscence of the great Aramaean movement from Chaldea up the Euphrates." The migration of Abram from Harran is "but a single wave upon the movement of a great stream of humanity" (p. 31). The reason for seeking southern Palestine instead of the more alluring region of Damascus or Hamath the author finds "in the strength of the Amorite states in Coele Syria as well as in the Hittite advance" and in "the weakness of Egyptian power in Palestine." "The most suitable time for Abram's immigration" Dr. Kraeling finds "toward the end of the seventeenth century when the Egyptian power in Syria stood at zero, owing to the internal troubles on account of the Hyksos." This puts Abram far later than the period commonly assigned to him in various systems of chronology and is a guess probably quite wide of the fact.

Much Aramaean coloring in the way of terms and customs is found in the Genesis record of Jacob's life. The phrase applied to him in Deuteronomy 26:5, which is rendered in the Authorized Version "a Syrian ready to perish" and in the Revised Version margin "a wandering Aramaean," is translated by Dr. Kraeling "a roving Aramaean;" and he adds that "because the Aramaeans migrated so much in those times, the name became almost synonymous with Roamer." After Jacob, our author thinks, the Hebrews entirely lost their Aramaean character and became virtually Canaanites in language, custom, and culture. The Exodus is placed about 1220 B.C., under Merneptah. Dr. Kraeling allows forty years for a stay in the desert, which gives the date 1180 for Balaam's coming from Pethor (or Pitru) on the Euphrates, and adds: "How remarkably this harmonizes with the fact that the Aramaeans at this time actually held Pitru!"

For sidelights upon the minutiae of Old Testament History in the words of the time of Saul and David, in the allusions to Hamath and Damascus and Samaria and Aphek and Hadrach (mentioned only in the prophecy of Zechariah and long denied any historical reality), in the careers of Omri and Ahab and Jehu and Ahaz, one may read with interest and profit the careful and intelligent summary of facts yielded up by the work of explorer, excavator, and decipherer. One feels a deepened regret that the Hittite inscriptions, which would cast such light on many puzzling questions, still stubbornly defy the efforts of scholars to discover their sealed secrets.

Aram was finally wrecked by the Assyrian power. But "in this its tragic fate Aram, like Israel, was led to the consummation of its mission. It is indeed a spectacle almost without analogy that the conquered can force its language upon the conqueror and upon a vast territory like the fertile crescent from Egypt to the Persian Gulf." The prominence and large number of Aramaean merchants along the great trade routes of the old world, the simpler structure and more legible script of the Aramaic language, helped to make the tongue the cosmopolitan speech of the day. It had no political home or connection after the overthrow of the Syrian and Mesopotamian states, so that no prejudice against its use hindered its onward march. With

the downfall of Assyrian Nineveh, in 606 B.C., it became the "means of communication between the Iranian east and the Semitic west," crowded out the Hebrew and Canaanitic, domesticated itself in Phoenicia and Edom and North Arabia and Palestine, so that "from the Persian Gulf to Cilicia, and from Edessa to Petra and to Syene on the Nile the Aramaic became the language of the common people" (p. 188f.).

We hear the echoes of its use in Mark's record of our Lord's sayings and in other passages in the New Testament, as the "Abba, Father" of Paul. Its importance for the world, Dr. Kraeling declares, was in the fact that "without it the expansion of Christianity in the Orient would have been unthinkable, just as it would have been unthinkable in the Occident without the Greek" (p. 139). "Its mission was not to create eternal values, as is the case with Hellas and Israel. It was rather the predestined medium through which these values were to be communicated throughout the Orient."

Many of Dr. Kraeling's interpretations of fact must undergo the searching tests of expert examination and later discovery. His view of the influence of the Aramaic language in connection with the spread of Christianity, from the later centuries of the Old Testament period to the rise and conquest of Islam, may provoke an interesting paper from some historian. Just as a minute piece of topographical work paves the way for a more accurate geography on a wide scale, so this scholarly study of a small bit of ancient history helps toward our final understanding of the great historic drama of the world that lay east and south of the Mediterranean Sea.

WILLIAM HOGE MARQUESS.

COUNTERFEIT MIRACLES*

ONE opens this book with no especial eagerness of expectation. The title makes no very urgent appeal. It sounds remote and scholastic, and we turn to the perusal of the book as one girds himself for a task that will certainly be laborious and probably wearisome. This impression is quickly dispelled.

*Counterfeit Miracles, by Benjamin B. Warfield (Thomas Smith Lectures for 1917-1918). New York, 1918. Pp. 327.

The reviewer has the impression that the most illuminating introduction he can give to this work will be simply to put on record his own unbounded delight in the reading of it.

What is it? A thorough-going review of extra-Biblical, religious, and semi-religious thaumaturgy ("teratology" one should say, to be strictly contemporary) from early Christian times to the present day, from the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles to Eddyism and mind-cure.

The discussion has this inestimable element of permanent value. It enters, explores, triangulates, and generally throws open to travel a region which hitherto for most Christians, even of the intelligent type, has been too misty for open vision and, therefore, dark with the menace of the unknown and exaggerated. This whole subject needed exploration by a competent student, with adequate historical apparatus and with sufficiently critical mind to sift evidence and to undertake the careful and judicious discrimination which is the first condition of dealing with problems so various and complex.

Dr. Warfield has done his work thoroughly and well. We cordially thank him for it. Every minister, teacher, and intelligent Christian layman with a sense of contemporary needs and dangers should not only read the discussion but become acquainted with the literature to which reference is made.

Dr. Warfield has adopted the method of placing his footnotes in a body at the end of the book. We say "end" by courtesy. Ninety-four very solidly printed pages are devoted to the notes, which not only add details together with manifold sidelights from other writers, but exhibit the corpus of data upon which the discussion rests and from which its convincing conclusions are drawn. Although naturally somewhat lacking in smoothness and continuity, the notes are almost as interesting reading as the text itself and form an adequate bibliography of the broad field of investigation.

Attention should be called particularly to the discussion of distinctly contemporary supernaturalism in the various systems of faith-healing and mind-cure. So far as I know there is no other discussion of these systems with so wide a background of cognate movements in the past or involving in text and notes such an exhaustive induction of pertinent data. Set in the

framework of the entire discussion and amplified by abundant references and valuations of other literature on the subject, the two lectures just referred to furnish the thoughtful student adequate means to make himself intelligent as to the claims of modern advocates of the various systems which attempt to direct human life in separation from the material instruments upon which ordinarily its support and conduct are supposed to rest.

Speaking of backgrounds, what could be more suggestive and informing than this? The claim of Stanton (*Presbyterian Review*, January, 1884, Vol. V, p. 49) that "dependence on God alone apart from all use of natural means * * * is the very essence of the matter" (in regard to faith-healing), Dr. Warfield illustrates by a note (p. 301, note 5) which shows that this attitude was adopted by certain pre-Christian Jews. "The Jerusalem Targum on Gen. 40:23 blames Joseph for asking the chief butler to remember him; he should have depended upon God's grace alone. Anyone who having food for to-day, asks, What I am to eat? fails in faith (Tanch., fol. 294). All means are to be excluded." It is quite clear that modern systems can neither be understood nor properly evaluated until their counterparts in the past are studied in the light of the results actually achieved in the lives of those who embraced them.

Dr. Warfield apparently has overlooked no important phase of his subject. For example, he does not fail to note that the nature of our Lord's miracles of healing come within the range of the discussion of other systems of practice in which healings are claimed and enforced by reference to the acts and words of Christ (see notes on pp. 302f.). Naturally, the "gift of healing" in the apostolic church comes in for full discussion. This has often been a source of distinct uneasiness to Christians, especially when under the pressure of energetic propaganda on the part of various kinds of faith-healers. Dr. Warfield's discussion of the subject ought to make it easy for intelligent followers of the New Testament to define and justify their position.

Further elaboration of this review, which claims to be nothing more than an appreciation, is unnecessary. The book speaks for itself. The reading of it is urged upon all who desire light upon an obscure and pressing problem.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET.

RELIGIONS OF THE PAST AND PRESENT¹

THIS volume consists of fourteen lectures, delivered during the winter of 1916-1917 by eleven members of the faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania. It is not a symposium in the strict sense, since the authors write upon different religions or religious periods. Each lecture forms a chapter, and the character and value of the collection as a whole may be judged somewhat from this list of chapters with their respective authors:

Primitive Religion, Frank G. Speck; The Egyptian Religion, W. Max Müller; The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, Morris Jastrow, Jr.; The Hebrew Religion, James A. Montgomery; The Religion of the Veda, Buddhism, Brahmanism and Hinduism, three chapters, Franklin Edgerton; Zoroastrianism, Roland G. Kent; Mohammedanism, Morris Jastrow, Jr.; The Religion of Greece, Walter Woodburn Hyde; The Religion of the Romans, George Depue Hadzsites; The Religion of the Teutons, Amandus Johnson; Early Christianity, William Romaine Newbold; Mediaeval Christianity, Arthur C. Howland.

Each author is a specialist, a member of the Department of the History of Religions in the great educational institution already mentioned. Hence these deliverances may be regarded as based upon the most recent findings of the world's scholarship in this great field. Even a casual examination reveals two or three features of these lectures which would almost seem to be the result of agreement among the lecturers themselves. One is the lack of a burdensome technical phraseology, so annoying to the lay reader. Again, there is evidence of the utmost independence of opinion and utterance on the part of each contributor; a writer is evidently not stressing this idea or suppressing that in obedience to editorial mandate or institutional policy. Furthermore, while there is of course clearly marked individuality of literary style, the lectures as a whole are characterized by a fine lucidity and directness of language which enables the reader to grasp the thought very readily. Definitions and salient points are set down in a terse, clear-cut English that should do much to make the volume popular outside the scholastic world.

¹Religions of the Past and Present, edited by James A. Montgomery. New York and London, 1918. Pp. 425.

It is out of the question to discuss each of the lectures adequately in this review, even if the reviewer were sufficiently a master of the history and literature of the great religions under discussion. The present comments are rather from the standpoint of the general, though greatly interested, reader. Still, impressions of several of the lectures may serve to give a more exact estimate of the book than the preceding general remarks.

The opening lecture, upon Primitive Religion, is the work of a specialist in anthropology, Dr. Speck. It is a concise account of such phases of the religious consciousness as manifest themselves in Animism, Totemism, Fetishism, and Taboo, with discussions of Primitive Ethics and the Culture Hero, and remarks upon the attitude of primitive religion toward monotheism and a future life. We do not recall having seen in the same space so clear and satisfactory a presentation of the topics indicated as appears in the few pages allotted to this lecture. It throws much light on the workings of the pagan mind and on the problems of dealing with it.

Dr. Müller's treatment of the Egyptian Religion may surprise old school admirers of ancient Egyptian culture by stating at the outset that "the popular overestimation" of the "religious wisdom" of that ancient people "is a great error." To this scholar the Egyptian religion "is an interesting link between the most rudimentary state of religious thinking and the development reached by other nations of the ancient western Orient." The description of the mythology and of the divinities of the country appears to substantiate Dr. Müller's views as to their primitive origin and nature. The persistence of these early religious characteristics are primarily due, he thinks, to a conservatism "nowhere so important as in ancient Egypt," the creed of whose people was not the product of their own thinking so much as "a bequest of their barbarous forefathers from fabulously ancient periods."

Of peculiar interest to the Christian scholar are, the chapter upon The Hebrew Religion, by Dr. Montgomery, professor of Hebrew in the University and editor of the book; the chapter upon Early Christianity, by Dr. Newbold; and that upon Mediaeval Christianity, by Dr. Howland.

Dr. Montgomery, after devoting a paragraph to questions as to the origin of the Hebrew religion, remarks: "This problem I will not seek to unravel, although I have my prejudices. The purpose of this course is not so much to give the history of the great religions as to present their great contents, especially as these have had effect and value in the world." His method stations us chiefly "in the Post-exilic age when theology and cult were permanently institutionalized." He also says rather significantly: "We shall have to take the Old Testament as it stands as the authoritative pronouncement upon itself by the Hebrew religion, and largely avoid the problems of origins and criticism." The effort then is to avoid technical and critical non-essentials and to throw into relief what the author considers the fundamental elements of the religion in question and also its effect upon mankind.

The author finds Kuenen's term, "ethical monotheism," "absolutely inadequate." "For the Hebrew Deity," he says, "did not become one in the sense of aloneness, as modern Theism or Deism requires, until the age of the Exile; while even after that period there were survivals and revivals of the older plurality or multiformity of deity, which condition Hebrew theology until at least the schism of the Christian Church, while it persisted later in Judaism in the form of Kabbalism." Monotheism, then, according to this scholar, was itself a rather progressive development with the Hebrews, however high the character of their God. The author's general attitude toward the Old Testament and its supreme theme we think is fairly well indicated by the following paragraph:

"In studying the Hebrew religion we have, I believe, to understand the spirit of its sacred volume as a whole. It is absurd to hold that the composition of that volume as late is representative only of the latest period, what we call Judaism. It is a compilation of earliest and latest sources, in that sense the volume is not one, but a variegated library. But it is one in its presentation of one great consistent theme, that of the historical providence of God, of a God with a purpose for his people and finally also for the world."

Dr. Newbold's treatment of Early Christianity is the most coldly analytical of the three chapters above noted as especially

attractive to Christian students. But one must keep in mind that he is not reading after a Christian apologist but after a student of history, who prefers to approach this subject as he might that of any other religion. So, while not frankly reverent, in the believer's sense, it may still be called reverently frank. The claims of Christ, the teachings of His apostles, and the mutual influence upon each other of the Gospel and Hellenic culture are clearly given as the author sees them. The exact significance of one or two statements is not altogether clear, as, for example, when he says concerning Christ's teachings: "Yet, notwithstanding these extraordinary claims for Himself, He never made Himself a part of His Gospel. He demanded that men should accept His message as authoritative, but He never demanded that they should accept even His own statements about Himself as part of the message." In the light of John 8:20-30; 10:30; 14:1, 6, 11, and other familiar passages it is difficult to be sure of the meaning of the words quoted.

However, the central point of this discussion is that the personality of Jesus is the great controlling element of Christianity. To quote from the author's closing paragraph: "The essence of early Christianity is not to be found in its institutions, ritual or doctrine. * * * But at the very outset it essentially was the kindling of the spiritual life in the hearts of many men under the same conditions—namely, the preaching of Jesus as Lord and Saviour."

The closing lecture of the series is that upon Mediaeval Christianity, by Dr. Howland. Its style is especially easy and clear, and one follows with close attention the author's swift strokes as he sketches in the conditions and dominant factors of that dark millennium that extended, roughly, from 500 to 1500 A.D., or from the fall of the Roman Empire to the Reformation. Here a very large place is given to monasticism, the ark which bore true spiritual Christianity above the flood of formalism and worldliness that marked the church during those centuries. The principles, the nature, and the work of monasticism, together with its influence upon human society, are presented with warm coloring and occasional incident. The reader gains a good perspective of the religious history of the whole period. This chapter might be taken as an example of style for the popular presentation of history.

The general attitude of the scholars who submit their views here is of the detached, scientific kind, as though careful not to permit their private religious sympathies or aversions to influence their calm intellectual appraisal of the matters in hand. Yet as one lays aside the volume, he is sensible of the fact that a line may be clearly drawn through the whole series of lectures between the treatment of non-Biblical and that of Biblical, religion. Despite the unemotional scholarly atmosphere, a note of admiration, a sense of power, an acknowledgment of real accomplishment, and a glow of hope pervade the pages devoted to the faith set forth by the Scriptures, making those given to other religions merely the portrayals of the futility of the soul's unaided search for God.

ROBERT M. KURTZ.

RECENT COMMENT UPON

The Biblical Review

Someone was good enough to send me the January issue, and I must say that I have not enjoyed for many a day such a treat as it contained.—*Rev. Charles H. Brown, Frelighsburg, Canada.*

Writers of eminence are the contributors, and evidently no expense is spared in the production of this noble quarterly. For students who find themselves out of harmony with the extreme critical position of a number of theological journals this, with its sane orthodoxy, will be the very thing.—*The Epworth Era.*

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW is rendering very conspicuous service as an expositor and champion of the faith once delivered to the saints.—*The Christian Intelligencer.*

Many of my brethren write me that it is "the most helpful periodical they receive."—*Rev. A. H. Tuttle, D. D., East Orange, New Jersey.*

I find the Review very scholarly and excellent, and it is a wonder to me that you can publish it at this price.—*William S. Bean, Librarian Presbyterian College of South Carolina.*

I like the sane, scholarly, and timely topics which are treated.—*Rev. A. H. Ericsson, Littleton, New Hampshire.*

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$1.00 A YEAR
ADD THIRTY CENTS FOR FOREIGN POSTAGE

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW
541 LEXINGTON AVENUE . . . NEW YORK